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## PREFACE

## TO THE THIRD AND FOURTH VOLUMES.

My first words must be words of regret. The lamented death of Professor Susemihl not many months ago, which no one deplores more than I do, leaves a great gap in the ranks of Aristotelian scholars. His learning, his industry and powers of work, his thoroughness, and his acuteness will long be missed. The students of Aristotle's writings have abundant cause to be grateful to him, and none more so than myself. Even when I have differed from him most, I have always found his views suggestive and instructive. It was from him that I first learnt what the close study of a work of Aristotle's meant.

Of the friends who gave me assistance in the revision of the proofs of my first two volumes three-Mr. Alfred Robinson, Mr. R. L. Nettleship, and Mr. Evelyn Abbottare, to my deep regret, no more. I have especially often missed the valued help of Mr. Alfred Robinson, whose death several years ago was a great loss to many besides myself.

Owing to weak health, the Warden of Wadham, Mr. G. E. Thorley, has, unfortunately for me, been unable to give me the assistance which he kindly gave me in the revision of the proofs of the first two volumes. Professor Bywater's suggestions have been but fewfar fewer than I could have wished-but, on the other hand, I have gained a new and very valuable ally in Mr. Herbert Richards, whose Greek scholarship needs no
commendation from me, and who has most kindly found time to peruse all the proofs of the explanatory notes contained in the third and fourth volumes and to give me the benefit of his comments on them, which have been, I need not say, of great use to me, though I am alone responsible for the views expressed in this work. The references in the General Index under the name of Mr. Richards will suffice to show how many valuable suggestions I owe to him. For emendations of the text and transpositions not explicitly attributed to him I am responsible.

In five or six of the Additions and Corrections to Vols. I, II, and III placed at the end of Vol. III I have profited by some remarks on my commentary on the first two Books kindly sent me by Prof. Robinson Ellis in 1888 shortly after its appearance.

To all who have assisted me with information or suggestions in the correction of the proofs, and among them to the readers of the Press, my best thanks are due.

To Mr. F. G. Kenyon I am greatly indebted for the collation of MS. Harl. 6874 which I publish in an Appendix to my third volume. Many students have had cause to testify to his unvarying kindness and readiness to assist, and I can add my emphatic testimony to theirs.

I have not carried my collation of the Politics in $\mathrm{O}^{1}$ (MS. i12, Corpus Christi College, Oxford) beyond the first two Books, but I have completed my collation of MS. Phillipps 89I (z), a manuscript of William of Moerbeke's Latin Translation which, as will be seen from my critical notes (see for instance those on 1306 a 24 and 1315 b 31), occasionally offers excellent readings, found in no other MS. of the Latin Translation hitherto collated. It is throughout akin to a, though it sometimes differs from a, but the original reading of a has often been erased by a corrector, and where this has happened, the original
reading of $z$ commonly remains intact and furnishes a probable clue to the original reading of a. I have again to thank the owner of the Phillipps Library, Cheltenham, for giving me every facility for the collation of this MS.

A list of the symbols and abbreviations used in the work will be found at the end of the fourth volume.

In my third and fourth volumes I have been able to refer to the English translation by Messes. Costelloe and Muirhead of the volume of Weller's Philosophic der Griechen which relates to Aristotle, and to the English translation by Messes. Brooks and Nicklin of the first volume of Gilbert's Handbuch der griechischen Staatsalterthümer. The first volume of Gerth's edition of the Syntax of Kühner's Greek Grammar did not appear till my revision of the proofs of the third volume was almost completed. My references to Dittenberger's Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum are for a similar reason mostly to the first edition. The references in the first two volumes to Meisterhans, Grammatik der attischen Inschriften are to the first edition of the work, those in the third and fourth to the second edition, published in 1888.

NOVEMBER, 1901.
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## ON THE MANUSCRIPTS OF THE POLITICS AND THE LATIN TRANSLATION OF WILLIAM OF MOERBEKE. II.

The following remarks are in continuation of those contained in vol. ii. p. xli sqq. My object in them has especially been to study the characteristics of the two families into which the MSS. of the Politics fall and the errors to which they are most liable, and also to throw light on the methods of translation adopted in the vetus erersio, in the hope that these inquiries may help us to discover the true reading in the many cases in which the MSS. of the two families offer different readings.

It has long been observed (see vol. ii. p. lvii) that the Omissions MSS. of the first family $\left(\Pi^{1}\right)$ are prone to omit both sen- in $\Pi^{1}$. tences and words. These omissions occur less often in some Books than in others. They are less numerous in the Sixth (old Fourth), the Seventh (old Fifth), and the Eighth (old Sixth) than in the other Books. Very few omissions occur between I 326 b and I330a (inclusive of these columns), none in I $33^{2}$ b and 1333 a, I $334 \mathrm{a}, \mathrm{I} 33^{8} \mathrm{a}$, and I 340 a.

Sentences are omitted in $\Pi^{1}$ owing to a similarity of ending in 1253 b 25, 1275 a 28, 1287 b 38, 1337 a 29, b 25, and 1299 a 8, owing to a similarity of the beginning in 1324 b 28 and 1311b 37, and for no clear reason in 1275 a 11 and 1331 a 21.

Single words are still more often omitted in $\Pi^{1}$, and
especially small words, as I have pointed out in Class. Rev. $7 \cdot 305$ (1893). Out of 184 omissions in $\Pi^{1} 117$ are omissions of words of one syllable. 'If I do not err, kai is omitted in $\Pi^{1}$ twenty-four times in the course of the Politics, $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ eight and $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ nine times, $\tau \iota s$ and its parts six times, єivaı five times, ă $\nu$ five times, and $\grave{\epsilon}_{\kappa}$ thrice. $\quad \mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ omit the article thirty-five times, and $\tau \epsilon$ eight times, and very possibly $\Gamma$ did the like, though of this we cannot be sure, for the Vetus Interpres seldom renders $\tau \epsilon$, and, writing in Latin, of course seldom renders the article ' (Class. Rev. ibid.). $\Pi^{1}$ are particularly prone to omit $\eta_{\eta}, k a l$, and the article, where these small words are repeated near together. See as to $\eta$ I268 a 6, 1282 a I7, 1324 b 30, 1298 b 32, and 1305 a 32 (it is in these passages only that $\eta$ is omitted in $\Pi^{1}$ ); as to kai 1253 a 1, 25, 1255 a 5,1259 b 3 1, 1260b 17, 1263 a 23 , $1264 \mathrm{a} 16,1317 \mathrm{~b} 6$; as to the article $1265 \mathrm{a} 12,1266 \mathrm{~b} 3$, 1268 a 17,1269 a 38,1272 b 28 , 1279 a 34,1282 a 40,1285 a


Nor is it only sentences and words that $\Pi^{1}$ are apt to omit. These MSS. often omit syllables, mostly the first or last syllables of words-the first in 1262a30, 1273 a 10, 1283 a 11 (here, however, the $a v$ - of àvıбór $\eta \tau a$ is omitted because $\pi a ̂ \sigma a v$ precedes), 1285 b 36,1342 b 32 , and 1298 a 31 ; the last in $1268 \mathrm{~b} 16,1276 \mathrm{~b} 20,1278 \mathrm{~b} 40,1283 \mathrm{~b} 20$, 1287 b 19, 1335 b 35, and 1315 a 15. In 1336 b 20 and 1300 b 28 the first two syllables are omitted in $\Pi^{1}$. In 1335 b 4 and $13{ }^{17}$ a $3^{6}$ a syllable or more than a syllable is omitted from the middle of the word. The first letter of a word is clearly omitted in $\Pi^{1}$ in 1324 b 30 and 1315 b 18, and probably in 1265 b 19, 1297 b 7, and 1320 a 29 ; the last letter often disappears, especially when it is a $\nu$ or s (sce 1255 a 39, 1265 b 21, 1267 b 40, 1337 b 41, 1297 a 17 , $1300 \mathrm{a} 32,1308 \mathrm{~b} 25$, and 1309 a 3 I ). On the other hand, two or three words are repeated in $\Pi^{1}$ in 1333 b 38 and 1297 a 24.

Many omissions occur in $\Pi^{2}$ also, and some of them are omissions of a sentence or of more sentences than one.

Such omissions occur in 1334a 37, I337 b 16-20, 34-35, 1298a 6, I301 a 30-31, 1307 b 32-34, but they are easily explained, for they are caused by a similarity of ending. In 1292 b 32 , if $\Pi^{2}$ are wrong in omitting the sentence omitted, they have not this excuse. In 1336b i8 the words omitted by $\Pi^{2}$ are probably rightly omitted. Omissions of two words occur in 1285b 16 (ai $\pi$ árpıo $)$, 1326 b 32 ( $\tau \grave{v} \nu \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \rho \circ \nu$ ), and 1335 a 37 ( $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \chi \rho \eta \hat{\sigma} \theta a \iota)$ : at least it seems likely that $\Pi^{2}$ are wrong in omitting these words. Omissions of a single word occur in 1259 a 37 ( $\mu \mu^{\prime} \rho \eta$ ), 1276 a 33
 perhaps in 1304 b 6 , where airial may have dropped out after ai. Omissions of small words, and especially of каí and the article, are frequent in $\Pi^{2}$, though not nearly as frequent as in $\Pi^{1}$. Omissions of a syllable occur in $\Pi^{2}$ in 1294 b 26
 $3^{8}$ ( $\left.\sigma v \nu a \theta \rho o i ́ \zeta \omega \nu \Pi^{1}, \dot{a} \theta \rho o i ́ \zeta \omega \nu \Pi^{2}\right)$. It is not often that $\Pi^{2}$ can clearly be shown to omit a letter.

We note in $\Pi^{2}$ a certain tendency to substitute ofor $\omega$ (e. g. in 1269 a 23, 1274 b I3, 1286a 37, 1294 b 38, 1302 b 6 , and 1317 a 39), and these MSS. substitute ov for $\omega$ in 1273a 9 and 1314a 18, and $\omega$ for ov in r301 a 38 and 1307 a $3^{8 .}$

In five passages $\Pi^{2}$ have the aorist infinitive, while $\Pi^{1}$ (or at any rate $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, for the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain) have the present infinitive. These passages are 1260 b 36 , 1267 a 35 , 1284 a 5 , 1332 b I, and 1317 a 36.

Some errors in the MSS. go back to an early date ; thus Errors of the errors of $\phi \iota \Lambda i ́ t \iota a$ for $\phi \iota \Delta i ́ t ı a$ in $\Pi^{1}$ (1271 a 27,1272 a 2 , tran of tripb 34), of Oí $\iota \iota \hat{\nu}$, Ovaial for ©vбı $\omega v$, ©voial in $\Pi^{1}$ ( 1285 b io, early date 16), and of $\Delta \in i$ for ' $A \in i$ in $\Pi$ ( 1296 b 7 ) no doubt originated wise. in days when uncials were in use.

Errors shared by all the MSS. and the Vetus Interpres must also have originated early. Under this head fall-

[^0]1278 a 34，aù $\bar{\omega} \nu \nu$ for $\dot{a} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$（aù $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ TII，but à $\sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ Vat．Pal．and Codex Hamilton）
1280 b 4，à $\delta \iota \bar{\prime} \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ for $\mathfrak{a} \delta \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma v \sigma \iota \nu$
1287 a 4，ßaбintias for mo入ıreias（Julian seems to have read ßaбı入cias：see critical note）
1324 b 37 ，$\delta \in \sigma \pi o ́ \zeta o \nu$ for $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \sigma \tau o ́ \nu$
1327 a 21 ，$\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu$ ious for $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu$ оиs
32，imápXov for vimápХоขтa
1337 а 1，кал⿳亠人s for как $\omega$ s
1296 a 9，$\pi$ о $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \omega ิ \nu$ for $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \omega ิ \nu$

${ }^{1} 306$ а 30 ，$\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu$ ор for $\sigma i \mu о \nu$

Errors which we find in all extant MSS．，though they were probably not present in the Greek text used by the Vetus Interpres，will also be of early date．Under this head fall－

1260 b 4 I ，íótŋs for cis ó $\tau \eta \mathrm{\eta}$

1278 b 20，$\pi \in \rho \mathrm{i}$ for $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~$


Confusions of letters．

The mistakes which have given rise to these erroneous readings are mistakes easily made，and they frequently recur in the MSS．of the Politics．We often note a con－ fusion of $\epsilon$ and $\eta$（as in 1274 b 7 ），of $\iota$ and $\epsilon \iota$（as in 1260 b 4 I ），of $\omega$ and ov（as in 1280 b 4 ），of $\pi a \rho \alpha$ and $\pi \in \rho i$（as in
 $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu o v s$ and $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu$ iovs（as in 1327 a 21 ）．For the inter－ change of кăv and кai reference may be made to $12 S_{2} \mathrm{~b} 8$ and 1290 a I，for that of $o$ and ot in 1276 b 9 to 1271 a 40 and to Vat．Pal．in 1275 b io，and for that of кал $\omega$ s and $\kappa а \kappa \hat{\omega} s$ to 1294 a 7 ，while the change of $\dot{a} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ into aù $\bar{\omega} \nu$ ，of $\sum i \mu o \nu$ into $\sum \dot{c} \mu o \nu$ ，and of $\epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \tau \iota$ into $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ needs no explanation． The substitution of $\dot{v} \pi \dot{a} \rho X{ }^{\circ} v$ for $i \pi a ́ p \chi o \nu \tau a$ is probably due to the omission of a $\tau$ over the last syllable of $\dot{v} \pi \alpha^{\rho} \rho \chi o v$. That of $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \delta \dot{\delta} \delta \nu$ for $\delta \epsilon \epsilon \pi \pi \sigma \sigma \tau o ́ v$ appears to point to a con－ fusion of $\sigma \tau$ and $\zeta$ ．The erroneous readings in the four

[^1]remaining passages (1287a 4, 1300 a 2, 1266 b 2, 1283 a 7) are easily explainable.

Among other confusions of letters which are of frequent occurrence in the Politics may be mentioned those of a with at (I290b 19, 1309b37, 1318 a 3, 1322b 37), of at with of (1268a II, 1274b 14, I285a 24, b 5, I339a I, 1294a 37, I313b 39), of av with ov (1274a 4, I280a 29, 1338 a 31), of ous with ovs (1292 b 36, 1309 b 14) and perhaps with $\omega v$ (I272a 29, b 16, I302b 30), of a with $\epsilon v$, which occurs in 1288 a 15 not only in $\Pi^{2}$, but also in Vat. Pal., and of $\eta$ with $\epsilon \iota$ and $o$ with $\omega$ and $o v$, which are too common to need illustration.

The variations of reading hitherto noticed have been due Errors in to errors of transcription, but many variations of reading in the MSS. are evidently due not to this cause, but to the from the occasional use in the MSS. copied by the scribes, or perhaps use of amin the archetype, of ambiguous contractions or contractions contraceasily misread or misinterpreted. Just as in the first the like. of the four handwritings of the papyrus of the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quai } \omega v\end{aligned}$ Польтє́a o written above the line stands indiscriminately for -ou oov -ov -ots and oovs (see Sandys, 'A0. Пo入. p. xxxvi), so in the MSS. from which the existing MSS. of the Politics were copied the terminations of words, and especially of common words like the cases of av̉rós and oûros, were probably often represented by ambiguous contractions.

In 1337 a 28 , where the true reading is avioòv, $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ has $\dot{a} v$ with $\tau$ added over it, and it is very likely that the Vetus Interpres found the same contraction in the Greek text used by him and took it to represent aùt $\omega \nu$, for his rendering is ipsorum. The next word in the same line is variously given by $\mathrm{P}^{3} \Pi^{3}$ as aùvoû, by $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ as av̉r $\hat{\omega}$, and by $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ as avit $\hat{\omega}$, the fact probably being that the writers of all these MSS. had before them an ambiguous contraction (perhaps $a v$ with $\tau$ over it). So in $13{ }^{12} \mathrm{~b} 9 \mathrm{P}^{2 \cdot 3}$ have $a v$ with $\tau$ over it, and the other MSS. make more or less successful attempts to interpret this contraction, $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ having avir $\hat{\mathrm{s}}$ s rightly, $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ aùr $\hat{\rho}$, $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ Ald. avirov̂, and so forth. The same
thing holds of oûros. In I297 a I $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ has $\tau 0 v$ with $\tau$ over it, $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ тoúr $\omega$, and the rest rightly roúrovs, the ambiguous contraction reproduced in $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ being interpreted with varying success by the rest.

In $1283 \mathrm{~b} 9 \mathrm{M}^{8}$ has $\dot{v} \pi a \rho^{\prime}$ with $\chi$ added over $\rho^{\prime}, \mathrm{P}^{1} \dot{v} \pi a ́ \rho \chi \in \iota$,
 with $\tau$ over $a$ and $\mathrm{P}^{1} \chi^{\prime} \iota \rho \frac{\rho}{} \boldsymbol{\nu} \eta^{\prime} \sigma a \nu \tau a s$, the true reading being $\chi \in \iota \rho о \tau о \nu \eta \eta_{\sigma}$ оутa: in 1335 a $27 \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ has $\pi \lambda \eta$ with $\theta^{\prime}$ over $\eta$, which Vet. Int. perhaps interprets, though wrongly, by his rendering multum: in 1303 b $33 \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ has a symbol for the termination of the word which Vet. Int. renders Estiacis : in 1309 b $28 \mathrm{P}^{3}$ has $\pi o m$ with $\sigma$ over $\eta$ and $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{2} \pi o \neq \eta \sigma \eta$, the true reading being $\pi o \iota \eta \quad \sigma \epsilon \iota$. It is probably owing to the use of an ambiguous contraction for távzas that many MSS. have $\pi a ́ v v$ in 1286 a 25 , and we may explain in a similar way the frequent interchange in the MSS. of $\pi$ ódis $\pi o \lambda i \not i m s$ and mo入ıтєía (see for instance Susemihl's apparatus criticus in $1326 \mathrm{~b} 5, \mathrm{I} 304 \mathrm{a}$ 17, and 1318 a 9), and the false reading $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \iota \nu o v\rangle \mu \nu$ in place of $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \iota \nu o \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ which we find in $\Pi^{1}$ in 1289a 1 (cp. 1267 a 25, where $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ has $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu \hat{v}$ in place of $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu \circ \hat{v} \sigma \iota v$, the reading of $\mathrm{P}^{1}$, and $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu \eta \dot{\jmath} \sigma v \sigma \iota \nu$, the reading of $\Gamma \Pi^{2}$, and 1258 b 4 , where $\Pi^{1}$ have $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho \rho \iota \sigma \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \theta a$ and $\Pi^{2}$ ${ }_{\epsilon} \pi \pi \rho(i \sigma \theta \eta)$. The divergence of the MSS. in 1282 a 27 ,
 and $\Gamma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma / \sigma \tau a$, may also be thus explained. For other possible instances of the same thing see the passages referred to in vol. ii. p. 1 , note 2.

That errors may have arisen from this cause at a very early date is clear from the fact that the papyrus of the 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { quai } \omega \nu \text { Подıтєía is full of contractions, though, according }\end{aligned}$ to Mr. Kenyon (Palaeography of Greek Papyri, p. 92), it is 'highly probable' that it was 'written not very far from the year $90^{\prime}$. If the writers of the MSS. of the Politics which have come down to us, or the writers of the MSS. they copied, have had to any large extent to expand contractions of the kind described above, skill will have been needed by them in the discharge of their function no less than fidelity. We must bear this in mind in reference to
the question of the comparative claims of the two families of MSS. There can be little doubt that they both descend from an archetype in which ambiguous contractions were occasionally, and perhaps frequently, used, and the question evidently arises, which set of copyists, those of the first or those of the second family, was the more successful in expanding these ambiguous contractions. This is a question which it is not easy to answer positively, but the presumption is in favour of the more careful copyists, and, if we may judge by a comparison of omissions, the copyists to whom we owe the MSS. of the second family did their work more carefully than those to whom we owe the MSS. of the first. It would be rash, however, to dogmatize as to the superiority of either of the two families of MSS. in passages which are likely to have been affected by this source of error.

So far we have been concerned with variations of reading Variations of a more or less minute kind. In not a few cases, however, of reading the readings offered by $\Pi^{1}$ diverge widely from those minute offered by $\Pi^{2}$. The following list comprises most of the ${ }^{\text {kind. }}$ more marked and less easily explicable of these divergences :-

| Book I. $\quad \Pi^{1}$ | $\Pi$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1254 a 15, ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | $8{ }^{\text {e }}$ |
|  | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{\mu}$ a |
|  | таугахо仑ิ |
| b 26 , тоútต |  |
| 1256 b I, комі'¢ขvat | торiSovrat |
| 1258 b 27 , тє́тартор | трírov |

Book II.

1260 b 28 , Tis ( $\Gamma$ ?




1264 b 3 I , 8 e
$\hat{\eta}$
 $\mu$ 'िpet toùs ťoous eïkelv (or оікєiv) óдоіovs (or ó доішs)

$\gamma$ à $\rho$

## $\Pi^{1}$

1265 a 4 ，єis（ $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ ？）
35，${ }^{\epsilon \xi} \xi \iota \nu$

1267 b 26，ко́м ${ }^{1}$
1268 b 5，8ikns
1269 b 2 I ，тоьоิ̃тоs évтi»
127 Ib 28 ，кр ${ }^{2} \tau \epsilon s$
1272 а 35，Є̈к $\tau \iota \nu \omega \nu$
1273 a 4I，тaútŋ̀ oủ久 oióv te $\beta \in$－ $\beta$ aíws àpıттократєíӨaı $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi 0 \lambda_{\imath \tau \epsilon} \dot{a} \nu$

Book III．


Book IV（VII）．

| 1326 a $2 \mathrm{I}, \mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\nu}$ | $\mu о р i \omega \nu$ |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | ${ }_{\alpha}{ }^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ |
| 1328 a 14，ขоцi¢оvбı | ข̇то入анßávovбヶ |
| $\mathrm{b} 55, \hat{a}(\Gamma$ ？$)$ | ¢ $\nu$ |
| 1329 a 20，$\mu$ ¢́pos | révos |
| b $\times 3$ ， 8 ¢ | $\gamma \mathrm{a} \rho$ |
| 1330 b 14 ，таúv̇ข | тoıaúrท |
| 2 I ，oike $\mathrm{i}^{\omega} \nu$ | i ${ }^{\text {i }}$ i $\omega \nu$ |
| 1332 b 40 ，тòv toloûtov | тov̂тò тòv |
| 1335 b 4，тaıðeias | таıооуоріая |
| 28，$\delta \in \hat{\imath}$（ $\Gamma$ ？$)$ | $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ |
| 39，кaì | $\stackrel{\square}{7}$ |
|  | ขоцоӨєтךтє́ор |

Book V（VIII）．

```
1337 a 36, \delta\iotaà
    b 22, \epsilonïp\etara\iota (\Gamma ?)
1337 a \(3^{6}\) ，ס九à
\(\pi \epsilon \rho i\)
D 22，єiрŋтat（ \(\Gamma\) ？
є \(\lambda \in \notin \theta \eta\)
```

$\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$
Síxata
$\mu \in \gamma^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu$
$\delta \eta \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \boldsymbol{}$
रoûv（oủv $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ ）
$\pi a ́ v v$
$\delta t a \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi \in \iota$
$\mu о р і \omega \nu$
${ }^{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta}_{\nu}$
ข̇тодацßávovбє
ఉ $\nu$
үévos
үà $\rho$
тоаиúтทข
ioí $\omega \nu$
тоиิтоу тò̀
таıסороріа
$\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$
\＃

$\pi \rho$ òs
$\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \iota$
àvayкaîov omitted
ко́б $\mu \omega$ тодขтє $\epsilon \epsilon і ̈$
крі́ $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$

入úктьо

таútๆข oủX ờóv $\tau^{\prime}$ єival $\beta \epsilon-$
ßaiws ảpıттократıкク̀ $\boldsymbol{\pi} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \imath-$ тєíà

## $\Pi^{1}$



Book VI (IV).

```
1289 a 5, シे
    8, \gammaà\rho or \gammaà\rho \deltaò
I292 a I7, ó \delta\hat{\eta}\muos ovitos
I293 a 2I, \hat{ ` oi}
        24, \pio\lambda\lambda\omega\hat{\nu}
    b 24, ảmo\deltao0\epsiloní\sigmaas
1294 a 36, à
I298 b ІЗ, тро́то\nu
I300 b 30, \pia\rhoóvт\iota
```

Book VII (V).
1301 b 26, таขтахо̂̂ $\Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$
1308 b I7, oũт $\omega$ คข $\theta \mu i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$
1310 br , ai тupavví̊єs


## Book VIII (VI).


$132 \mathrm{Ia} 5, \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$
$\Pi^{2}$

زoūv
$\gamma$ à $\rho$
бацßи́кає
тaьסєià oiov
тov̂

ס̀
ó тooov̂tos $\delta \hat{\eta} \mu$ os
Єỉ $\mu \in \grave{\nu}$
ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$

ฝ̀
§ıорıбно́v
$\pi а \nu \tau і$
$\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$
оข้т
$\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \cup \rho a \nu \nu i ́ \delta \omega \nu$
$\pi а р a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ or $\pi a \rho a i \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$

тоúr $\omega \nu$
тoîs $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \frac{i ̂ s}{s}$
$\hat{\eta}$
тà $\tau a \rho a \nu \tau i v \omega \nu$

кá $\lambda \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$

Of the above sixty-two divergences twelve are due to Tendency a source of error which-and this has not, I think, been of the MSS., hitherto pointed out-especially affects the first family of cially of $\Pi^{\prime}$, MSS. I refer to the tendency of these MSS. to introduce ${ }^{\text {to repeat a }}$ a word into the text which they repeat from a neighbouring words from line, often the preceding or following line, the word thus a conti- line.
repeated sometimes extruding another word from the text and sometimes not doing so. Thus in $\Pi^{1}$ -
in 1255 a $24 a ̈ \mu a$ is displaced by ${ }^{0} \lambda \omega s$ probably repeated from 2 I ;
 30 sq.;
in 1265 a 35 X $\rho \eta \sigma \sigma \nu$ is displaced by ${ }_{\xi}^{\xi} \iota \nu$ probably repeated from

in 1266 a 37 àvaरккiov is added after civun, being repeated from à даүкаi $\omega \nu$ in the preceding line;
 preceding line ;
in 1326 a $2 \mathrm{I} \mu \rho \boldsymbol{\rho}^{\prime} \omega \nu$ is displaced by $\mu \epsilon \rho \bar{\omega} \nu$ probably repeated from $\mu$ épos in the preceding line ;
 from vopísovatv in the following line;

in 1289 a 5 тov̂ is displaced by $\hat{\eta}$ repeated from the preceding line;
 preceding line;
 repeated from $\mu \eta \delta^{\circ}$ ỏ̀ıгархкк̀̀ $\nu$ in 2.

In $1268 \mathrm{~b} 5 \Pi^{2}$ appear to fall into a similar error, $\delta i \kappa \eta=$ being displaced in these MSS. by крí $\sigma \omega \omega$ s repeated from the preceding line.

Occasionally all the MSS., and not those of the first or second family only, may be reasonably suspected of this error. Thus in $7_{00}(5) .7$. 1306 b 39, where all the MSS.

 probably repeated by mistake from the preceding line. So again it is possible that in 2.5 .1263 a 13 , where almost all the MSS. have $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávovtas, and in 2.6 .1265 b 2 , where all have $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon s$, they have suffered in a similar way, $\lambda a \mu$ $\beta$ ávovtas being repeated from $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávovat in the following line and $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ ràs $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon s$ from $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau a ̀ s ~} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota s$ in the preceding line. The same thing may have happened to all the MSS. in 2.7. 1267 a 8 , where $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu 0 \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ may have taken the place of $\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa o \hat{\epsilon} \epsilon \nu$ through repetition from $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota 0 v \mu i a r, 6$ (see explanatory note

## POLITICS AND THE VETUS VERSIO．II．xvii

on 1267 a 5），in 2．8． 1268 b I ，where $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma \eta^{\prime} \sigma \in \iota$ may have displaced some other word owing to the presence of $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho$－ youvtas in the preceding line，and in 4 （7）．9．1329 a 14， where $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a \nu$ may be a repetition of $\pi$ o入ıтєíav in 1329 a 12 and may have pushed out some other and more appro－ priate word（see explanatory note on 1329 a I3）．
$\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{8}$ are sometimes affected by this cause of error when $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ escapes．Thus in 2．6． 1265 b II ẳ入入aıs repeated from ${ }_{a}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ in the preceding line has displaced $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ i $\sigma \tau a \iota s$ in $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ， in $4(7)$ ．4．I 326 a $3 \beta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda$ tiod from the preceding line has displaced кá $\lambda \lambda \iota o v$ in $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ and probably $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．melius）， and in 4 （7）．II．I330 b 25 т $\rho$ ónov from the preceding line has displaced $\chi$ póvov in $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ．

The MSS．of the second family are not free from this kind of error，though they have suffered much less from it than those of the first．We have already seen that in 1268 b 5 кpi $\sigma \epsilon \omega \mathrm{s}$ repeated from the preceding line probably takes the place of $\delta i \kappa \eta$ s in $\Pi^{2}$ ．So again in 2．4．1262 b 33
 $\pi$ odíras occurs in the preceding line，and in 6 （4）．14． 1298 b $35 \mathrm{P}^{2.3}$ add $\tau \grave{o}$ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os after $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \pi o \epsilon \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ because $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \pi o \epsilon \epsilon \hat{L} \nu \tau o ̀$ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os occurs in the following line．

Twelve，then，of the sixty－two variations of reading which Other have been enumerated may be thus accounted for．Five which vari－ others（1255 b 26，1330 b 14，I 332 b 40，1292 a 17，1317 bations of 17）are due to an interchange of ov̂tos and rooovios，four minutekind （1264 b 31，I 329 b 13， 1340 b 7，I289 a 8）to an interchange are due． of $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ and $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$（the contractions being somewhat similar）， and the eleven following to an interchange of not very dissimilar words－

1256 b r，коці乌оитає and торі乡оутає
1282 b 5，ठtopiซat and $\delta \eta \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \alpha \iota$
$\left.\begin{array}{l}1285 \text { a } 12 \\ 1339 \\ \text { b } \\ 21\end{array}\right\}$ yáp and yoûv
1287 а 3 I ，$\delta \iota a \phi \theta_{\epsilon i \rho \epsilon \iota}$ and $\delta \iota a \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon ́ \phi є \iota$

1293 a 24，$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \bar{\omega}$ and ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1300 \mathrm{~b} 30 \text {, } \pi a \rho o ́ \nu \tau \iota \text { and } \pi a \nu \tau i \\
& 1319 \text { a 7, тoîs } \pi a \lambda a t o i ̂ s ~ a n d ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda o i ̂ s ~ \\
& { }^{1} 321 \text { a 5, } \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ a n d ~ к a ́ \lambda \lambda ı \sigma \tau a . ~ . ~
\end{aligned}
$$

In two other passages (1271 b 28 and 1308 b 17) a gloss has probably displaced the true reading in $\Pi^{1}$, and in three ( 1335 b 4, I 336 b 20 , and 1342 b 32 ) one or more syllables have been omitted in $\Pi^{1}$. The variations of reading in 1267 b 26 and 1269 b 21 are probably due to the tendency of $\Pi^{1}$ to omit words. In 1286 a 25 the substitution of $\pi a ́ v v$ for $\pi a ́ \nu \tau a s$, and in 1301 b 26 that of $\pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ for $\pi a \nu$ raxov, may well be due to ambiguous contractions. In 1258 b 27 the substitution of téraprov for rpícov, though wrong, is natural enough, $\tau \rho i$ irov having occurred in 25 . In 1330 b 2 I the substitution in $\Pi^{1}$ of oiкєi $i \omega \nu$ for $i \delta i \omega \nu$ is explained in the critical note on the passage. In 1282 a 32 the interchange of $\mu \epsilon \iota \zeta \delta \nu \omega \nu$ and $\mu \epsilon \gamma{ }^{\prime} \lambda \omega \nu$ resembles
 and $\beta \epsilon \in \lambda \tau \iota o v$ in I 333 b 7 , and that of $\phi a v \epsilon \rho \omega \tau$ át $\eta$ and $\phi a \nu \epsilon \rho \omega-$ т $\epsilon$ pa in 1293 b 32. As to 1261 b 2 and 1273 a 41 something has already been said in vol. ii. pp. 234 sq. and 1 v . The following variations of reading remain, sixteen in number:-
$\Pi^{1} \quad \Pi^{2}$
1254 a I $5, \stackrel{\text { ® }}{ }$ v
1260 b 28 , tis ( $\Gamma$ ? )
I265 a 4, cis ( $\Gamma$ ? )
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { I28I a } \\ \text { I } 335 \\ \text { b }\end{array}\right\} \delta \delta \in \hat{i}(\Gamma ?)$

1326 a 25 , oủ $\mu \eta{ }_{\nu}^{\nu} \boldsymbol{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$
$\left.\begin{array}{lll}1328 & x^{2} & 5\end{array}\right\}$ a
1294 a $3^{6}$
1335 b 39, каі
1337 a 36 , òà

1293 a 21 , $\hat{\eta}$ oi
r310 b I7, ai тupapvíoes
${ }^{1} 3^{\text {I }} 5$ а $3^{8}$, à фаíєоь ( $\Gamma$ ? )

## $\delta_{6}^{\prime}$

$\hat{\eta}$
$\pi \rho o ̀ s$
$\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$
Sikata
$a ̉ \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta{ }^{2} \nu$
$\stackrel{\Phi}{\omega}$
$\stackrel{*}{\eta}$
$\pi \in \rho l$
є̀ $\lambda \in \notin \theta \eta$
ci $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
$\tau \omega ิ \nu$ тטрaขvi $\delta \omega \nu$
тараíрєбเข or тараivєбเข

# $\Pi^{1}$ <br> <br> $\Pi^{2}$ 

 <br> <br> $\Pi^{2}$}
 таралтivต $\nu$ followed by a lacuna $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$, $\tau \eta{ }^{2} \nu \tau-$ раขтiv $\omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \eta_{\nu} \Gamma$ ?
In seven of these passages ( $1260 \mathrm{~b} 28,1265 \mathrm{a} 4, \mathrm{I} 28 \mathrm{I}$ a 17 , 1335 b 28, 1281 a 28, 1335 b 39, 1337 b 22) words not themselves similar, but of similar meaning are interchanged, and in an eighth ( $3^{r} 55^{8}$ ) the interchange of $\dot{a} \phi a i \rho \in \sigma \iota \nu$ and $\pi a \rho a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ may well be the result of accident. The divergences in the remaining eight ( 1254 a 15,1326 a 25,1328 b 15, 1294a36, 1337a 36, 1293 a 21, 1310b 17, 1320b 9) are less easily explained.

A certain number of variations of reading are probably Variations due, as has been said already in vol. ii. p. liii, to grammarian revisers of the text. Thus, while both families use the nominative $\mu$ óvapxos (I292 a II, I5 and I3I3b 39), not $\mu o v a ́ p \chi \eta s, \Pi^{2}$ use the oblique cases of $\mu$ óvapxos, $\Pi^{1}$ almost always those of $\mu$ ovápx $\eta^{1}$. So again $M^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$
 and in 1256 a $6 \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ have кєркьоотоьך$\tau \iota \kappa \eta$, while $\Pi^{2}$ have кєркьঠотоикท'. In 1289 b 32 , again, $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ have ăo ${ }^{\circ} \pi \lambda o v, \Pi^{2}$ ävo $\pi \lambda o v$. These differences of reading seem to be due to intentional correction, but others which are at first sight of a similar nature are probably due to accidental causes. Thus $\Pi^{1}$ inherit the form $\phi \iota \lambda i \tau \iota a$ and $\Pi^{2}$ the form фioítia, the rival forms originating at the outset no doubt in the resemblance of $\Lambda$ and $\Delta$. It is probably also owing to accident that in $1280 \mathrm{a} 29 \Pi^{2}$ have $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon{ }^{\prime} \gamma \kappa \alpha \nu \tau a$ and $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ (we cannot be certain as to $\Gamma$ ) $\epsilon i \sigma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \gamma \kappa o ́ v \tau a$, in $1283 \mathrm{~b} 14 \Pi^{2}$ oógal $\epsilon \nu$ and

 in $1292 \mathrm{~b} 9 \Pi^{2} \epsilon i \pi a \mu \in \nu$ and $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1} \epsilon i \pi \pi o \mu \epsilon \nu$, in $\mathrm{I} 3 \mathrm{O} 2 \mathrm{~b} 4 \Pi^{2} \delta \iota a ̀$


[^2] It is easy to confuse $a v$ and $o v, a \iota$ and $o \iota, a$ and $o, \epsilon$ and $\eta$. If in $1338 \mathrm{~b}_{23} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{s}}$ Ald. have $\lambda_{\eta \sigma \tau \rho \iota \kappa}$ and $\Pi^{2}$ (except $L^{\text {s }}$ Ald.) $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\alpha}$, we remember that $\tau$ and $\tau \rho$ are easily confused, and that in $1336 \mathrm{~b} 3 \circ \Pi^{2}$ have $\theta \epsilon a \tau \hat{\omega} v$ and $\Pi^{1} \theta \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \nu$.

When $\Pi^{1}$ and $\Pi^{2}$ offer different readings, $\Pi^{2}$ are probably to be followed more often than $\Pi^{1}$.

In cases in which the two families of MSS. offer different readings I am still of opinion, as I have been from the first, that the MSS. of the second family deserve our confidence more often than those of the first. The comparative merits of the readings offered by the two families vary from Book to Book, and in no Book does the first family stand the comparison as well as in the Second, yet even there it seems to me that the second family has the advantage. My reasons for so thinking have been given in an article which appeared in the Classical Review in July, 1893 (7. 304 sqq.).

Even where the readings of the first family receive the support of the Vatican Palimpsest, they are not always to be adopted. This will be evident on a reference to 1287 a 32, b 4I, and 1288 a 13 .

It has been pointed out in vol. ii. p. lix that not much weight attaches to readings supported by $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ against the consent of $\Gamma \Pi^{2}$, or to those supported by $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{g}}$ against the consent of $P^{1} \Pi^{2}$. On the other hand (and this has not as yet, I think, been pointed out) readings supported by $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ against the consent of $M^{8} \Pi^{2}$ are very often correct. This will be found to be the case in the following passages:-

[^3]

1289 a 17 , éкácтoıs $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$, ékáorns the rest;
1290 a I, $\delta \dot{\eta} \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$, $\delta \in i$ the rest, except correctors in $\mathrm{P}^{2.4}$;
$1294 \mathrm{~b} 29, \tau \hat{\omega} \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ the rest;
1295 b 34, $\theta \in \lambda \omega \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}, \theta^{2} \lambda \omega \nu$ the rest;
${ }_{1314 \mathrm{a}}{ }^{5}$ 5, $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ oûv $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}, \mu \hat{\mu} \nu$ the rest;



For passages in which the accentuation is corrected in $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ see critical note on I293 a 28. It has already been remarked (vol. ii. p. xliii, note 3) that Demetrius Chalcondylas, the scribe of $\mathrm{P}^{1}$, was a learned scholar and that many of the good readings peculiar to $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ are probably emendations of his, and the question might be asked whether the good readings which $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ shares with $\Gamma$ were not suggested to Demetrius by a study of the vetus versio. How far it is likely that Demetrius would study the vetus versio, I am unable to say, but I doubt whether he owes these readings to it, for it is evident from passages like 1280 b 6 , where the true reading is $\delta \iota a \sigma \kappa о \pi о \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ and $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ has $\delta \iota a \kappa о \pi о \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$, while $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ have $\delta \iota а к о \nu о \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$, that $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ has a good independent tradition of its own. In 1297 a 1 and (if Sus. ${ }^{1}$ is right, for in Sus. ${ }^{2.3 .4}$ the erroneous reading is ascribed to $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ) in 126I $\mathrm{b} 27 \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ agree in a false reading which $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ is not likely to have borrowed from the vetus versio.

In some passages of the Politics the true reading is The true preserved by one MS. only and in not a few by two or reading is three: thus it is preserved by $\Gamma$ in $1260 \mathrm{~b} 41,1266 \mathrm{~b} 2$, served by 1283 a 7 etc., by $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{8}$ in 1299 a I , by $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{4} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ in 1299 a 2 , by one, thro $\Gamma$ Ald. corr. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ in $133^{2}$ a 33, by $\mathrm{P}^{2.3}$ Vat. Pal. in 1278 b 30 , MSS. only. by $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ and a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ in 1304 b 28 , by $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ Ald. in 1286 b 33. We sometimes owe the true reading to quite inferior MSS. (e.g. in 1275 b 39, 1284b 40, 1295 a 28, 1296 b 31, 1308 b 15, 1317 a 12, 1318 b 17, 1320 a 16).

Not a few good readings are due to the Latin translation Emendaof Aretinus (Lionardo Bruni of Arezzo, who was born in Aretinus.

1369 and died in 1444). They are probably conjectural emendations of his. Among them the following may be mentioned :-

```
1264 а 19, vi\piо\mu\epsilon\nuоv̂\sigma\iota (Г П v́\piо\muќ\nuоv\sigma\iota);
```



```
1339 a 20, v̋\pi\nu\omega (\Gamma \Pi o\iota\nu\omega);
1296а 9,\piо\lambda\iota\tau\hat{\nu}\nu(\Gamma П \piо\lambda\iota\tau\epsilon\iota\omegaิ\nu);
1299 a 14 (with 'ut videtur, corr. . P',' says Sus. ', and corr. . P'
                                    means Demetrius Chalcondylas), \pio\lambda\iota\tau\epsiloniats (\Gamma \Pi
                                    \piо\lambda\iotaтє\hat{a\iota);}
    b 36, aṽTa\iota ai (aùraì ai }\mp@subsup{\Pi}{}{2}\mathrm{ , ai aủraì }\mp@subsup{\Pi}{}{1}\mathrm{ );
1300 b 4, \tauó \tau\epsilon (the rest \tauò \delta仑̀ or \tauó\tau\epsilon \delta\epsiloǹ or \tauò \tau\epsiloń \delta\epsiloǹ);
I3II a IO, \tauò \tauò (the rest \tau\hat{\omega}\tauò or \tau\hat{\omega});
I3I7 b 4I, \epsilon゙\tau\iota (ГП є̇\pii).
```

That the Fifth (old Eighth) and the Eighth (old Sixth) Books are incomplete, we have seen already (vol. ii. p. xxix). It is probable that something is wanting at the end of the Seventh (old Fifth) Book also. The question, however, to what extent ordinary lacunae occur in the text of the Politics is one of a different kind. That a small lacuna exists in the best MSS. in 1285a 19 has already been noticed (vol. ii. p. lxvi). A somewhat larger one appears to occur in $\Gamma \Pi$ in 4 (7). 15. 1 334 b 4 after the word $\dot{a} \rho \epsilon \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ (see explanatory note on I 334 a 41). It seems likely that several omissions occur in the passage 1300 a 23-b 5. Words appear to have fallen out of the text in I3OI a 6 , 1307 a 3 I, and 1320 b 35 also.
In two instances the transposition of passages has seemed to me to be called for: I have suggested the transposition




Traces of the handiwork of an editor piecing together disquisitions originally unconnected appear to be especially visible in the Sixth (old Fourth) Book (see explanatory notes on 1289 b 27 and 1290b 21-24). Prof. W. Christ remarks in the preface to his edition of the Metaphysics of Aristotlc (p. xviii), 'Philosophus iis quae chartae iam
mandaverat haud contentus nova subinde in margine adiecit, quae qui post auctoris mortem eius libros divulgarunt parum circumspecte primariae orationi intexuisse videntur'. We may perhaps account in this way for the state in which we find the Third and Fourth Chapters of the Sixth (old Fourth) Book (see vol. i. Appendix A and explanatory note on 1289 b 27 ).

A few remarks may be added to what has already been Remarks said with regard to the translation of the Vetus Interpres on the in vol. ii. p. xli sqq. A further study of this translation has versio. confirmed my impression (see vol. ii. p. lxiv) that he often misread his Greek text; thus for example in 1285 b 7 he renders $\pi$ opícaı emerunt, probably misreading it as $\pi \rho \dot{\prime} a \sigma \theta a \iota$,
 apparently as $\dot{\delta} p \mu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} v a l$, in 1330 a II he appears to misread $\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota v$ as $\pi a ̂ \sigma \iota v$, in I34I b $3^{1}$ túnovs as $\tau \rho o ́ \pi o v s$, in I29I a II
 would be easy to add many other instances.

It should be pointed out that the Vetus Interpres often uses two different Latin words to render the same Greek word when it is repeated close together ; thus in 1338 b 28
 ad cos qui non studuerant conabantur, in 1295 b 30 his equivalent for $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu o v o \tau \nu$ is desiderant and in 3 I concupiscunt,
 neque insidias patiuntur neque fraudes moliuntur: see also his renderings in 1303 b 14, 15 ( (óćá $\sigma a \sigma \iota \nu$ ), 1304a 19, 20, 25
 passages. This is not always so: thus in 1299b 13 he translates $\dot{a} \rho \chi a ́ s$ and $\dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ occurring in the same line principatus and principatum. On the other hand, he often uses one Latin word in rendering two Greek words occurring close together; thus in 1303a 35, 36 he translates both $\epsilon i \sigma \delta \bar{\epsilon} \xi \dot{\alpha} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$ and $\dot{v} \pi о \delta \delta \epsilon \xi \dot{a} \mu \in \nu 0 \iota$ suscipientes, in 1304a 21-24
 in $1304 \mathrm{~b} 30,33$ both $\sigma v \sigma \tau \dot{d} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ and $\dot{a} \theta_{\rho} \rho o l \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ are represented by coadunati, in 1305 a 39, 40 praeses represents
 conatus est represents $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \in \chi \in i \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon$ and conantur $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \chi \in \iota \rho \circ \hat{\nu} \sigma \iota$ ．

In rendering Greek words he often selects，if he can， a Latin word connected in meaning with the Greek；thus his equivalent for $\delta \eta \mu \in v \sigma \iota s$ is populatio in 1298 a 6，for
 minorata in 1319a 3，for à arvyeitovas municipales vicinos in 1330 a 17 ．

He sometimes retains the case of the Greek in his rendering，notwithstanding that in Latin it is wrong：so in 1299 b 33 we have populi pracconsiliari for тov̂ ốmov $\pi \rho \circ$ ßov－
 and in 1304b II，I2 voluntariorum transmutant politiam

 always do．

In addition to the inexactnesses in translation mentioned in vol．ii．p．lxiii it may be noted that the Vetus Interpres often renders a verb as passive where it should be rendered as middle ${ }^{1}$ ，and often renders the present tense by the future ${ }^{2}$ and a future participle by a present participle ${ }^{3}$ ． He also sometimes renders the singular by the plural ${ }^{4}$ and the plural by the singular ${ }^{6}$ ，the comparative by the positive ${ }^{6}$ ， the superlative by the positive ${ }^{7}$ or the comparative ${ }^{8}$ ，and the positive by the comparative ${ }^{9}$ or the superlative ${ }^{10}$ ．

[^4][^5]Since I wrote in vol. ii. p. lvi that, as Vet. Int. has qui mutazcrit in 1269a 18, he may have found not кu' $\eta$ бas, but o кıvíras in his Greek text, I have discovered that qui mutaverit there probably stands simply for $\kappa \iota v \eta$ 'бas (see critical note on 1340 b 24).

It has already been pointed out (vol. ii. p. lxiv) that the Vetus Interpres sometimes seeks to mend defects in his Greek text by slight conjectural alterations : to the cases already noticed may be added 1284 a 19 (where, finding ठокой $\iota$ omitted in his Greek text, as in $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, and being consequently unable to make sense of the passage, he translates $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ as if it were $\delta \iota \epsilon \kappa о v \sigma \iota$ ) and 1329 a I7, where for a similar reason he adds videtur.

Here and there in the MSS. of the vetus versio, as in those of the Politics, words find their way into the text from an adjacent line: thus in Sus. ${ }^{1}$ p. 536. 3 quod is wrongly added after aristocratiae, being evidently derived from the following line (see also the readings of a in Sus. ${ }^{1}$ pp. 296. 5 and 300.4). Sometimes two alternative equivalents for a word stand together in the text of the translation: thus in 1283a 9 two equivalents for к $\rho \in i ̂ t \tau o v$, melior and valentior, both appear in the text; the same thing perhaps
 promptus potens lege, the two words promptus and potens being probably alternative renderings of ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \gamma \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \circ$ s.

It is often difficult to decide whether false renderings in the vetus versio are due to error on the part of the trans-lator-for instance, to a misreading or mistranslation of the Greek text-or to corruption in the MSS. of the vetus versio. That they are sometimes due to the latter cause will be seen from the critical note on 1338 a 28. Corruption of the text may be suspected in 1270 a 35 , traiciebant (tradebant?)
 ( $\check{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \lambda \eta \mu a$ : obiectionem ?), 1331 а 2, insultus ( (тàs тольoркías),
 (è $\pi \iota \theta \epsilon \epsilon \mu \in \nu \circ \mathrm{S}), 1318$ b 3, permittere ( $\sigma v \mu \pi \epsilon i ̄ \sigma a l:$ persuadere?) and elsewhere.

## ON THE CONTENTS OF THE THIRD, FOURTH (SEVENTH), AND FIFTH (EIGHTH) BOOKS.

The Third The Third Book is addressed to a wider class than the Book. Fourth and Fifth (old Seventh and Eighth). It is addressed to the framers of all States, the Fourth and Fifth only to the framers of the 'best State'. Aristotle's aim in the Third Book is to point out how the State should be organized if its constitution is to be just, in the Fourth and Fifth how it should be organized if it is to be happy and to live the most desirable life.
c.. 1-5. The first five chapters of the Third Book are introductory to the rest. They are designed to show, (I) what is the minimum amount of rights which a citizen must possess if he is to be a citizen at all, and what further rights he will possess if he is to be a citizen in the fullest sense (cp. c. 5 .
 (2) that each constitution awards these rights to different persons, that a democracy, for instance, awards them to a wider class than an oligarchy or an aristocracy, so that, while a citizen in a democracy may be a day-labourer lacking the virtue of a citizen, or even a person of illegitimate or semi-alien birth, a citizen under the best constitution will possess, if a ruler, the full virtue not only of a good citizen, but also of a good man. Thus there are many kinds of citizen; the citizen varies with the constitution and rises and falls as it rises and falls. And as the citizen rises and falls, so the polis rises and falls, for the polis is an aggregate of citizens.

Thus these five chapters prepare the way for the study
of the best constitution, to which we pass in the last chapter of the Third Book. They would, however, have been in fuller harmony with the remainder of the Book, if in the account which they give of the citizen the fact had been kept in view that the polis may be ruled by a king or a few 'best men'. We hear nothing in these chapters of the citizen of a kingship or of an aristocracy in which a few 'best men' rule. They imply that a citizen shares both in ruling and in being ruled, but is this true of the citizen of a kingship or of an aristocracy of the kind just mentioned? We might have expected the study of the citizen which they contain to include not only a study of the citizen in a State consisting of men more or less alike and equal, but also a study of the citizen in a State ruled by a king or a few 'best men'. In this expectation we are disappointed.

At the beginning of the Sixth Chapter we pass from the Cc. 6-7. citizen and the polis to the constitution, the main subject of the Book, and indeed of the Politics. The question is now asked ( 1278 b 6 ) ' whether we are to hold that one constitution exists or more than one' (a question already answered by implication in c. I. I275 a 38 sqq. and c. 5.1278 a I 5), 'and, if more than one, what and how many there are and what differences exist between them'. In answer to this question we have first the division of constitutions into normal forms and deviation-forms, and then in c. 7. 1279 a 22 the question is again raised, 'how many constitutions there are and what they are', and we are told to study the normal constitutions first, for the deviation-forms will be manifest when these have been distinguished, the answer to the question how many constitutions there are coming in the shape of an enumeration of six constitutions.

Of this classification of constitutions something has already been said in vol. i. pp. 214-225. Reference may also be made to Class. Rev. 6. 289 sqq., where I have pointed out that, though Aristotle has before him Plato's classification of constitutions in Polit. 297, 301 I sqq., there are important differences between the two classifications. The
six constitutions of the Politicus, if we omit the best, are marked off from each other by their observance or nonobservance of law, whereas the six constitutions of the Politics are distinguished by a different test, their aim; the three good constitutions make their aim the common advantage of the citizens, while the three bad ones aim at the advantage of the ruling individual or class. Aristotle's classification implies that this difference of aim suffices to make one constitution different in kind from another.

It is open to objection on more grounds than one. In the first place, it leaves out of sight the possibility that the One, Few, or Many, or two of them, may share supremacy (see note on 1279a 27). Again, in 8 (6). I. 1316 b 39 sqq. we find that constitutions exist which are partly aristocratic, partly oligarchical, and others which are partly polities, partly democracies. These constitutions will be partly normal and partly deviation-forms ; they do not, therefore, fall under any of the six heads. Thus the classification is not exhaustive. Again, we can conceive the existence of constitutions under which rule is exercised for the advantage of the rulers, but yet for the common advantage, or partly for the one end, partly for the other (see note on 1279 a 17). These also fall outside the classification. And then again we might ask whether a constitution which, while it aims at the common advantage, takes a low view of that common advantage, construing it for instance as the acquisition of wealth or empire, should not also be treated as a distinct constitution from one which seeks the common advantage and studies it in a nobler way. Aristotle would perhaps reply that a constitution of this kind does not really study the common advantage. Still it cannot be said to study the advantage of a section of citizens only, and thus it appears to escape enumeration.

But in fact, as has been pointed out in vol.i. pp. 217-220, Aristotle tends on fuller consideration to rest the distinction between constitutions not on the number of rulers or the aim with which they rule, but rather on the attributevirtue, wealth, free birth, etc.- which they raise to supremacy.

Even this basis of classification, however, proves hardly satisfactory, for the absolute kingship and the true aristocracy raise the same attribute-fully equipped virtue-to supremacy (6.(4). 2. 1289a 32 sq.), and oligarchy and tyranny both do homage to wealth (7(5). 10. 1311 a 10). Yet Aristotle distinguishes between the absolute kingship and the true aristocracy, and also between oligarchy and tyranny.

Passing on to the Eighth Chapter, we are told in c. 8. C. 8. I279 b II sq. that it is necessary to state at slightly greater length ' what each of these constitutions is', the constitutions referred to being apparently the three deviation-forms. Little is said of tyranny in what follows, but the nature of oligarchy and democracy is more fully explained, and we learn that the distinction between them is to be found not so much in the comparative number of those who rule in each as in the fact that the rich rule in the one and the poor (or the free-born) in the other.

The Ninth Chapter is closely connected with the Eighth. C. 9 . It throws further light on the nature of oligarchy and democracy by examining the version of justice which underlies each of these constitutions and showing its inadequacy. The one claims more than its due for a superiority in wealth, and the other claims more than its due for an equality in free birth, neither wealth nor free birth being the end for which the polis is formed. The end for which the polis is formed is, in fact, good life, and those who contribute most to it have a better right to supreme power in the polis than the wealthy and free-born, if the two last-named classes are inferior in virtue. Thus the Ninth Chapter is a natural sequel to the Eighth, carrying its investigation of the nature of oligarchy and democracy further and using the conclusions as to the nature of these two constitutions arrived at in the Eighth ; it also, however, forms an introduction to the discussions which follow, preparing the way for the inquiries of $\mathrm{cc} .10-13$ on the subject, ' what ought to be the supreme authority of the polis'?
C.. 1o-1r. This question, the central question in any inquiry respecting constitutions, for the main business of a constitution is to determine the supreme authority of the polis (c. 6.1278 b 9 sq.), is discussed in the Tenth and Eleventh Chapters, and the conclusion is arrived at in C. II. 1282 b I-I 3 that the supreme authority in a polis should be rightly constituted laws, or in other words laws adjusted to the normal constitutions (for such laws will be just), the magistrate or magistrates being supreme only in respect of matters which the law owing to its generality cannot regulate aright. We might suppose that the question 'what ought to be the supreme authority of the polis' was now finally answered,
Cc. 12-13. but two chapters follow, the Twelfth and Thirteenth, which upset or greatly modify the conclusion arrived at in c. II, for they decide that in a certain case the supreme authority should not be laws of any kind, but the will of an absolute king raised above law.

There is much in these two chapters to suggest a doubt whether they were placed where they stand by Aristotle. They make an important modification in the conclusion arrived at in C. II, and yet do not do this explicitly. Again, the transition from c. II to c. 12 is very abrupt. Then again, the two chapters are not heralded by any previous announcement, nor are they closed with any recapitulation of their results. This is suspicious, for previous announcements and recapitulations are often wanting in the Politics in the case of chapters or passages which look like subsequent additions or interpolations (e.g. I. II : 2. 12. 1274a 22-b 26 : 4 (7). 10. 1329 a 34 -b 35). On the other hand, there are arguments to be urged in their favour. Some of these have been noticed in vol. i. Appendix C. The following may be added. The conclusion in favour of law arrived at in c. 11, which is upset or seriously modified by cc. 12 and 13 , can hardly represent Aristotle's final and matured opinion, for it conflicts as much with the contents of c .17 as with those of cc. 12 and 13. In both places we find a full recognition of the legitimacy under certain circumstances of an absolute kingship uncontrolled by law. We need
not, therefore, be surprised that the conclusions of c . II are modified in cc. 12 and 13. Then again, the mode in which cc. 12 and 13 refute the claims to exclusive supremacy preferred by the rich, the free-born, the good, and the many closely resembles that in which similar claims are refuted in the preceding chapters. Aristotle's plan throughout the Third Book is to refute exclusive claims to supremacy by arraying superior claims in opposition to them; thus in the Ninth Chapter he refutes the claims of the rich and the free-born by setting up against them those of the good, and in the Eleventh he refutes those of the few best by setting up against them those of the many. In just the same way in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Chapters he refutes the claims of the rich, the free-born, the good, and the many to exclusive supremacy by setting up against them those of a single individual of surpassing wealth, nobility, or virtue. Thus the method followed in these two chapters closely resembles that which has been followed in the chapters which precede them. As to the absence in them of a preliminary announcement and a recapitulation, the same thing is true of 4 (7). 14. 1333b 5-1334a 10 . We are not prepared by any preliminary announcement for the transition in 4 (7). 8. I 328 a 21 sqq., nor indeed for that in 4 (7). II. I330 a 34 sqq. On the whole I still incline to think that the Twelfth and Thirteenth Chapters were placed where they stand by Aristotle.

Their teaching is important. We learn from them a lesson which we have not been taught before, and which Aristotle appears to have been the first to teach. This is that the same constitution is not in place under all circumstances. If the constitution is to be just, the supreme authority which it sets up ought not only to be one which will rule for the common advantage, but also that which justice requires to exist in the particular case, looking to the distribution among the members of the community of the attributes which contribute to the being or wellbeing of the polis (virtuc, wealth, free birth, etc.). If the distribution of virtue and political capacity in a given
community is such as to call for an absolute kingship, an aristocracy or polity would be out of place in it, though both of these are normal constitutions, constitutions in which rule is exercised for the common advantage. And so again, if the distribution of virtue, wealth, free birth, etc., is such as to make a constitution just in which all classes share in rule, an absolute kingship would be out of place under those circumstances.

Another lesson which is especially insisted on in the Twelfth and Thirteenth Chapters is that a bare superiority in one only of the attributes which contribute to the being or well-being of the polis does not confer a right to exclusive supremacy. Nothing but a transcendent superiority in virtue and political capacity does so. We remember that Aristotle has rested natural slavery in a similar way on a vast disparity between master and slave (I. 5. 1254 b 16 sqq.: cp. 4 (7). 3. 1325 b 3 sqq.). Where this great disparity does not exist, and the good, the rich, and the free-born coexist in a community, and the many taken as a whole are superior to the few, the constitution must allow a fair share of power to all these classes (3.13.1283 b 40 sqq.). Aristotle goes so far as to say (3. I3. 1283 a 26 sqq.) that a constitution which gives exclusive supremacy to those possessed of a bare superiority in one attribute only is a deviation-form, and this he would apparently say even if the one attribute were virtue ${ }^{1}$. In the Seventh Chapter constitutions have been said to be deviation-forms in which the rulers rule with a view to their own advantage ; now we are told that a constitution is a deviation-form in which the rulers claim exclusive supremacy on the strength of a bare superiority in one attribute only. Aristotle's account of a deviation-form in the Thirtcenth Chapter is evidently not quite the same as that which he gives in the Seventh. According to the Thirteenth Chapter even an aristocracy may be a deviation-

[^6]form if the superiority in virtue to which it awards supremacy is a bare superiority only.

The discussion of kingship which follows in cc. 14-17 Cc. 14-17. contains a passage, 1288 a $6-15$, which may be intrusive or a subsequent addition, but it seems to be otherwise in correct order. We might have expected that more would be said about kingship than is said, and that Aristotle would follow up his study of it with a study of aristocracy. The kinds of kingship have been clearly distinguished, and why should not those of aristocracy be similarly enumerated ? This is not done; on the contrary, Aristotle passes C. 18. on to inquire in c. 18 which is the best of the normal constitutions, and he finds that the best is kingship or aristocracy, whence he infers that, as the citizen of the 'best State' is a good man, the citizen of a kingship or an aristocracy will be a good man, and a kingship or aristocracy will be brought into being by the education which produces good men. We expect him to proceed at once to inquire what education produces good men, but this, as has been pointed out in vol. i. p. 293 sq., he does not do till the Thirteenth Chapter of the Fourth (old Seventh) Book. The drift of the Eighteenth Chapter of the Third Book evidently is that if we wish to study how a kingship or an aristocracy is to be brought into being, we shall best do so by studying how the best constitution is to be brought into being (cp. 6 (4). 2. 1289 a 3 I sqq. and 7 (5). 10. 13 10 b 2 sq., 3 I sqq.). The chapter is apparently intended to account for the absence of an inquiry how a kingship or an aristocracy is to be brought into being and for the substitution in its place of an inquiry how the best constitution is to be brought into being and instituted. It evidently prepares the way for a study of the 'best State', though possibly for a different study of it from that which we possess in the Fourth and Fifth Books (the old Seventh and Eighth).

Aristotle's main aim in the Third Book is to correct and Remarks broaden the conceptions of justice on which Greek consti- Third VOL. III.
tutions were based, just as in the Fourth and Fifth (the old Seventh and Eighth) he seeks to correct and broaden Greek conceptions of happiness. He rises in the Third above the one-sidedness of oligarchy and democracy, just as in the Fourth and Fifth he rises above the one-sidedness of the Lacedaemonian State.

A marked characteristic of the Third Book is its union of tolerance for imperfect types of political organization with a clear recognition of what is best. Aristotle accepts the lower forms of the citizen and the constitution, but he also sets before us their higher forms. A defective citizen does not cease to be a citizen, nor a defective constitution to be a constitution. Any man is a citizen who possesses certain political rights, whether he is fit to have them or not, and any 'ordering of the supreme authority' is a constitution, even if it gives power to the wrong persons. Not only is the citizen not identical with the good man, but even the good citizen is not necessarily so. There are many grades of citizens and constitutions. As Aristotle holds that the polis exists to realize good life, we might have expected him to say that only those are citizens who are able and purposed to realize it, and only that a constitution which gives rule to those who will rule with a view to the realization of good life, but this he does not do. His wish evidently is not to deny the names of citizen and constitution to any type of citizen and constitution to which these names were given in the ordinary use of language, and yet to point to the type of citizen and constitution which best deserved the name.

The old Seventh and Eighth Books should be placed immediately after the Third, though they are not com.

The reasons why the old Seventh and Eighth Books should be placed after the Third have been adequately stated by Zeller (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. ii. p. 504) and others. The object of the Sccond Book, as we are told in its opening sentences, is to prepare the way for the inquiry what constitution is the best, and though, as has been already pointed out (vol. i. p. 226), the Third Book addresses itself to a different and
wider question, the inquiry what each constitution is, it pletely in prepares the way for the study of the best constitution harmony (vol. i. p. 291), and its last chapter concludes with the the transiwords, 'we must now attempt to state with respect to the tion from best constitution, in what way it comes into being and how it should be instituted', and with an unfinished fragment of the sentence with which the old Seventh Book begins. The inference is obvious that the old Seventh Book originally followed the Third in the MSS. It is not likely that Aristotle, after reaching the threshold of the inquiry as to the best constitution, and indeed actually beginning it, drew back again, and postponed its treatment till he had dealt in three Books (the old Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth) with the polity and the deviation-forms and with changes of constitution, thus parting this inquiry by a long interval from the Second and Third Books, with which it is so closely connected. The old Fourth Book, in fact, speaks of the inquiry into the best constitution as already over (6 (4). 2. 1289 a 30 sqq.), and though the inquiry on the subject which we possess may not have been written at the time when these words were penned, there seems to me to be little doubt that Aristotle intended to take up and deal with the question of the best constitution immediately after the Third Book.

It has, indeed, been suggested that the old Seventh and Eighth Books are an independent treatise, not originally designed to form part of the Politics, but the links between the old Seventh Book and the Second and Third are too numerous to allow of this supposition (see Class. Rev. 6. 291 sq.). No doubt, as has been pointed out in vol. i. p. 292 sqq., the Third and the old Seventh Books do not dovetail into each other with perfect exactness. The transition from the one to the other leaves something to be desired, and the old Seventh Book is not quite in all respects what the Third Book leads us to expect it to be. To the defects of harmony to which reference has been made in vol. i. p. 292 sqq. this may be added, that while the opening chapters of the Third Book define the citizen
as one who has access to deliberative and judicial office, the younger citizens of the State sketched in the old Seventh Book have no share in deliberative and judicial functions. A difference appears also to exist between the best constitution as sketched in the Fourth (old Seventh) Book, which must evidently be an aristocracy, and the account of aristocracy given in the Third Book. For though both in the best constitution of the former Book and in the aristocracy of the latter the rulers are a comparatively small number of men of high virtue, the reason why their rule is willingly accepted by the ruled is different in the two cases. In the one case it is willingly accepted because the ruled are men fitted to be ruled by rulers of this type as freemen should be ruled (3. 17. 1288 a 9 sqq.), whereas in the other it is willingly accepted because the rulers are older men, and because the ruled will become rulers in their turn on attaining a certain age. We hear nothing in the Third Book of the plan by which rule falls to men of superior age and is acquired by the ruled on the attainment of a certain age, nothing of these precautions for securing the willing submission of the ruled. The Fourth (old Seventh) Book appears to be written with a closer regard to what is practicable than the Third. It is conceivable that, as has been suggested in vol. ii. p. xxxi, note 2, the sketch of the 'best State' contained in the Fourth (old Seventh) Book is a second edition of an earlier sketch which was more completely in harmony with the teaching of the Third Book. But perhaps it is more likely that, some interval of time having elapsed between the composition of the two Books, Aristotle saw, when he came to depict the 'best State' in the Fourth (old Seventh) Book, that some things of which he had dreamed in the Third were but dreams. Thus the absolute kingship of which we hear so much in the Third is dismissed in the Fourth as no longer practicable, and the aristocracy described in the Third assumes a more practicable form in the Fourth ${ }^{1}$.

[^7]In writing the Fourth and Fifth (old Seventh and Eighth) Books Aristotle has three States especially before him, the weak points of which he does his best to avoid. These are the two ideal States sketched by Plato in his Republic and Laws and the Lacedaemonian State. The main differences between Aristotle's 'best State' and these three States have already been pointed out in the first volume, and our recapitulation of them here need only be a brief and summary one.

Fourth and Fifth Books Aristotle has three States especially before him, Plato's two ideal States and the Lacedaemonian State.
Aristotle's first objection to the State of the Republic His objecis that it does not realize happiness. None of its citizens $\begin{aligned} & \text { Stane to the } \\ & \text { State }\end{aligned}$ are truly happy. The most desirable life is not realized in sketched in it, the life of fully equipped virtuous activity, for though Plato's $\begin{aligned} & \text { Pepnblic. }\end{aligned}$ the first or ruling class has virtue, it has not the equipment which is needed for virtuous action. How can it practise liberality, for instance, if it has no property? Another weak point of Plato's State is that the members of the second and third classes, though called citizens, are not really so, for they have no share in ruling. The citizens of the 'best State', according to Aristotle, should be 'able and purposed to rule and be ruled with a view to the life in accordance with virtue', and this the second and third classes of Plato's State are not. The citizens of the 'best State', again, should be men of full virtue, and this cannot be said of the members of Plato's third class, even if it can be said of those of his second. Another weak point dwelt on by Aristotle is that the second class will be discontented with its position, as it is permanently excluded from rule. Aristotle further objects to the communism of the Republic. He wishes the land of his 'best State' to be owned by the men of full virtue who are its citizens, though they will freely share the use of it and of all their property with their fellow-citizens and with others. In these and in other points his 'best State' diverges from the State of the Republic.

It stands in marked contrast to the State of the Laws To the also. Its citizen-body and its territory are smaller The State life lived by its citizens is a more ideal life. It is not $\begin{aligned} & \text { Plawo's } \\ & \text { Laws. }\end{aligned}$

To the Itacedaemonian State.
simply 'temperate', but 'temperate and liberal', and its supreme end is not work, but leisure and contemplation, the diagog $\hat{e}$ which is the best employment of leisure. Its constitution differs from that of the State of the Laws. It is an aristocracy, not a polity inclining to oligarchy. It will not covertly favour the wealthier class in elections to offices. It will take stricter precautions against pauperism than the State of the Laws, placing a limit on the procreation of children, not merely on the number of the citizens.

To the Lacedaemonian State Aristotle's 'best State' stands in a relation of far more decided contrast. Plato in the Republic and Laws had sought happiness in the right direction, though in Aristotle's opinion he had failed to secure it for his citizens. The Lacedaemonian State did not do so; it sought happiness in empire, and valued virtue not for its own sake, but only as a means to empire and external goods. This error led it into a further error; its laws and training developed only one kind of virtue, that through which empire is won, military virtue. A third error was that it failed to train its citizens to make a right use of leisure and to live for diagog $\hat{e}$ as well as work. All these errors will be avoided in Aristotle's 'best State '. It will be a State living for the highest end, for leisure and diagog $\hat{e}$ more than for work, for peace more than for war, for things noble rather than for things necessary or useful. Its education will be a preparation for a life of this kind; it will develope the virtues of justice, temperance, and wisdom as well as military virtue, and it will develope military virtue better than the Lacedaemonian education did, for it will not brutalize the young by an over-laborious gymnastic training. The dependent classes of the State, unlike those of the Lacedacmonian State, will be organized aright. Its slave-system will be so constituted as to secure the efficiency and submissiveness of the slaves. Its women will not be uncontrolled and uneducated, nor will they be allowed to rule the men. Its citizens will be neither too few nor too many, their numbers being kept at the proper level by a wise regulation of marriage and the procreation
of children and of the right to buy and sell, give and bequeath ; there will be no extremes of wealth and poverty within their ranks, no undue love of honour or money; the State will be ruled by its best men, not by persons of no special excellence, and by statesmen who make peace rather than war their end, and who are not only men of action, but also men of philosophical aptitude, not by mere soldiers to whom war is the one thing worth living for. There will be no senate organized in a narrow oligarchical way, no ephorate with over-great powers. On minor contrasts we need not dwell.

Our knowledge of Aristotle's views on the subject of Aristotle's education is imperfect. Education, according to him, teaching on should vary with the constitution (I. 13. 1260 b 13 sqq. : of educa5 (8). 1. 1337 a 14 sqq.), yet the only scheme of education he gives us is that which is intended for the 'best State', so that we know little or nothing as to the kind of education which he would recommend under other forms of constitution than the best. That he wishes the State to concern itself with education in all forms of constitution is clear from 5 (8). I. 1337 a 12 sqq. (cp. 7 (5). 9. 1310 a 12 sqq.), where we are told that if the etthos which is appropriate to each constitution is not developed in the citizens-that is, the êthos which tends to the maintenance of each-the constitution will not last. The 'best State' for which his scheme of education is designed is a State very unlike those of the present day, for under Aristotle's best constitution the citizens are withdrawn from ' necessary activities' -the activities of agriculture, trade, and industry-in a way in which the men of modern States are not, and then again, a far longer gymnastic training was required in youth with a view to military efficiency in the Greece of Aristotle's day than is required in modern times. Thus we must be prepared to find much in Aristotle's scheme of education which is unsuitable to the present day. Still the broad principles on which it rests are not without interest even for ourselves.

We notice that his scheme includes no arrangements for the education of women and girls, notwithstanding what is said in 1. 13. 1260 b 13 sqq., or for the education of the non-citizen classes, notwithstanding what is said in 2.5. 1264 a 36 sqq. The due regulation of education involves, in Aristotle's opinion, the regulation of marriage and of the rearing of infant children during the years in which education in the strict sense of the word cannot be said to have begun, and this is fully kept in view by Aristotle, but when school-training has commenced for the child, Aristotle confines his attention to it, though we learn from Protagoras in Plato, Protag. 325 C sqq. that there are many influences not included in school-training which then promote a child's growth in virtue. Aristotle does not attempt to direct or regulate these.

His scheme of education for the 'best State' represents to a large extent a reaction against prevailing notions of education. In his criticism of the actual education of Greece he distinguishes between the States which paid special attention to the education of the young and undertook the direction of it, and the majority of States, which left its direction to the parent and allowed the child to be taught what the parent pleased in the way he thought best.
liducation in (ìreck States which did not undertake the direction of education.

In the latter class of States, to which Athens belonged, education was little better than a chaos. The parent's caprice was to a certain extent controlled by the general acceptance of four subjects of education-reading and writing, gymnastic, music, and drawing-but each parent was free to educate his children apart from the rest and to give a special prominence in their education to whichcver of these subjects he preferred, so that there was no sccurity for an identity of training, no enforcement of the principle that the citizen belongs to the State and not to himself, nor again was any care taken that the education given to children was in harmony with the constitution and favourable to its maintenance.

Marriage was left to a great extent unregulated, with the
result that children were often the offspring of over-young or over-old parents. The rearing of infancy was also left unregulated, nor were children's minds sufficiently protected from evil influences in the earlier years of life, the years in which, according to Aristotle, permanent tastes are formed. Not only were the games and nursery-tales of infancy often other than they should be, but children were allowed to be too much in the company of slaves ${ }^{1}$ and were too much exposed to hearing indecent language and seeing indecent pictures and statues. Boys and youths were allowed freely to witness the performance of iambi and comedy. The subjects chosen for youthful study were studied with a wrong aim and in a wrong way. Reading, writing, and drawing were studied merely for their utility, and music for the pleasure it gave. Music was often studied in too technical a fashion with a view to the attainment of a skill in execution suitable rather to virtuosi than to citizens. The only subject studied with a view to virtue was gymnastic, which was thought to produce courage. We do not hear of any studies by which it was sought to develope other virtues. Education in these States was evidently too utilitarian ${ }^{2}$ and too narrow in its aim ; it needed to be made more capable of influencing the character as a whole and the reason.

The States, on the other hand, which paid special attention to the education of the young and made it a matter of Education in the Lacedaemonian public concern erred in a somewhat different way. The State.

[^8]virtues of a higher kind (4 (7). I4. 1333b 9 sq.). In 5 (8). 3. 1338 a 37 sqq. he hints, not without some quiet sarcasm, that reading and writing should not be studied with a merely utilitarian aim, but rather because studying them enables us to master other studies, and that drawing should not be studied to save us from being cheated in the purchase of household utensils, but because the study of it makes us scientific observers of physical beauty, adding that ' to seek what is useful everywhere does not at all befit great-souled and freespirited men'.

Lacedaemonian State was one of them. We do not learn from Aristotle whether more care was taken at Sparta than elsewhere to regulate marriage and the rearing of infants and to protect early childhood from corrupting influences, but we know that, at any rate after a certain age, the State took the education of the young into its own hands, withdrawing it from the control of the parent, and educating the boys together and in the same way and with a view to the welfare of the whole State, severing them to a great extent from home and from contact with slaves. So far it did well, but its gymnastic training was too severe and laborious, and here again, as elsewhere, the education given was too narrow, failing to train the whole man, and also too utilitarian, though it studied that which was useful to the State rather than that which was useful to the individual. Its aim was to develope the more utilitarian virtues (4 (7). 14. 1333 b 9 sq.), the virtues which favour the acquisition of empire, not to develope all the virtues nor to develope virtue for its own sake. The Lacedaemonian training was not even the best training for war or the winning of empire; much less was it the best for the preservation of empire when won, for it did not develope justice or temperance or the intellectual excellence which enables men to use aright the leisure which follows the acquisition of empire, and saves them from degenerating under the influence of ease and plenty and peace. It was based on a systematic preference of that which is useful to that which is noble, of that which is lower to that which is higher, of that which is only a means to that which is the end. It taught men to prefer external goods and empire to virtue, the lower kinds of virtue to the higher, war to peace, and work to leisure.

Aristotle's conception of education.

Aristotle's aim in education is to develope the whole man-the body, the appetites ( $\partial \rho \rho \varepsilon \xi \xi \in \epsilon s$, including $\theta r \mu o{ }^{\prime}$, ${ }^{2} \pi \iota \theta v \mu i a$, and $\beta$ ov́d $\eta \sigma \iota s$ : see note on 1334b 19), and the reason-in such a way as to harmonize the three elements in a willing co-operation for the best end, a life spent in the exercise of all the virtues, moral and intellectual, and
especially the highest of them, those connected with the right use of leisure. In Aristotle's view he is a truly educated man who has learnt from youth upwards to love virtue for its own sake, and virtue not of one kind only, but of all, whose youthful love of virtue has been crowned with reason, and in whom reason, fully developed both on its practical and on its contemplative side and working for the best end, is mated with appetites which take pleasure in obeying it and with a body well prepared for the service of both. Aristotle's conception of education agrees with his conception of the man of full virtue ( $\sigma \pi$ ovóaios) as a man in whom many excellences are combined (3.11. 128 i b 10 sqq.). He would not be satisfied with an education which merely brought the body and the lower appetites under the control of some higher appetite, such as the love of the good; the appetites must, indeed, be trained to love what is good, but that is not enough; they must be brought under the control of reason fully developed and directed to the best end ${ }^{1}$.

As the body developes before the soul and the appetites of the soul before reason, the education of the body should come first, then that of the appetites, and then that of the reason, but the body must be so trained as to subserve the development of the soul, and the appetites so trained as to subserve the development of the reason. The body and the appetites are apparently conceived by Aristotle as trained by habituation (5 (8). $3.133^{8} \mathrm{~b} 4 \mathrm{sq}$.), or in other words by a repetition of acts resulting in a formed habit, whereas the reason is mainly trained by instruction (Eth. Nic. 2. 1. 1103a 15 sq.: Pol. 4(7). 13. 1332 b 10 sq.). Thus training by habituation comes first, training by reason later (Pol. 5 (8). 3. 1338 b 4 sq.). We have been already told in the Nicomachean Ethics (10. 10. 1179 b 23 sqq.) that training by habituation must precede training by

[^9]xliv
teaching, but the cause assigned there for this is not that reason developes later than the body and the appetites, but that training by teaching will not be effectual in producing virtue if it is not preceded by a long course of habituation beginning in childhood.
The educa-
The education of the body must, in Aristotle's view, be such as to make it a fit instrument for the soul; its growth must not be stunted nor its beauty impaired (5) (8). 4. 1338 b 9 sqq.), it must not be subjected in early youth to toils so excessive as to enfeeble it for the work of afteryears ( $5(8) .4 .1338 \mathrm{~b} 40 \mathrm{sqq}$.) or to brutalize the character ( 5 (8). 4. I $33^{8}$ b in sqq.), nor must hard work be imposed on the body and mind simultaneously (5 (8). 4. I339a 7 sqq.), nor again must the training of the body be such as to unfit it for subsequent studies or to produce $\beta$ avavaía (5 (8). 6.1341 a 6 sqq.).
The educa- The education of the appetites-i.e. of $\theta v \mu o ́ s, ~ \grave{e} \pi \iota \theta v \mu i a$, tion of the appetites. and $\beta$ ov́ $\lambda \eta \sigma t$-must be such as to lead them to love the noble qualities of character which reason will later on give them additional reasons for loving, and thus to prepare them to render a willing obedience to reason when it developes. The appetites must, therefore, be habituated to take pleasure in the right things ; the child must be watched and guided in its pleasures from infancy. A wellordered gymnastic training must follow, not too laborious in early youth, and, midway in this, three years devoted to the study of reading, writing, drawing, and music. The musical training of the young should be such as to lead them to love ennobling melodies and the reproductions of mildness, courage, temperance, and other virtues which melodies contain, and so eventually to love these virtues themselves. Music should be the ally and precursor of reason, preparing the way for her before she appears, and beginning the wholesome discipline of the likings which she will later on carry to completion. No attempt must be made to hasten the development of reason, but, on the other hand, there must be nothing in the musical training of youth which will not be favourable to it ; the use of the pipe (aìdós) in
education, for instance, is not favourable to it (5(8). 6. 134I b 6), and therefore must be rejected.

So important a part of youthful education is the training of the appetites to feel pleasure in the right things represented by Aristotle to be, that we might be tempted to take it for the whole. But the training of the body and the reason are also essential parts of youthful education; indeed, Aristotle sometimes distinguishes $\pi a \iota \delta e i ́ a ~ f r o m ~$ habituation (e.g. in 3. 18. 1288 b 1 and 7 (5). 9. 1310 a 16 ), or in other words from the training of the appetites.

The direct education of the reason, which is to follow the The educacducation of the appetites, is not dealt with in the Politics $\begin{aligned} & \text { tion of the } \\ & \text { reason. }\end{aligned}$ as it has come down to us, though we may infer from 4 (7). 14. 1333 a 24 sqq. that it will be directed to the development both of the practical and of the contemplative reason, and will make the development of the latter its supreme end.

Aristotle's conception of education commends itself to us Remarks more than the scheme by which he seeks to realize it. on the sheme by The amount of time which he devotes to gymnastic training which appears to us to be disproportionately large. He surrenders to it all the years from seven to twenty-one with the exception of three. He does so partly because in ancient Greece, as we have seen, a long gymnastic training in youth was essential to full military efficiency, partly because without a suitably developed body neither the appetites nor the reason can be all that they should be, and partly because, as hard mental and bodily work must not be required of the young simultaneously, and bodily exercise is indispensable in youth for the growth and development of the body, mental work in youth must necessarily be confined within narrow limits. He is thus led greatly to shorten the amount of time devoted in youth to the work to which he attaches so much import-ance-that of training the appetites to take pleasure in the right things. For this kind of training he relies mainly on the study of music, and yet he allots to this study only a very small part of the first twenty-one years of lifevol. III.
a fraction of the three years after puberty which he gives up to other studies than gymnastic. Does he not hope too much from this brief musical training? Can it do all that he expects it to do for the moral improvement of the boys who are to receive it? It may be doubted, indeed, whether it is by a study of particular subjects, such as music, that a love of what is noble is instilled into the young. Is it not rather by intercourse with a parent or teacher or friend whose example and influence win the heart to a love of goodness? Then again, does not Aristotle underrate the extent to which the reason is susceptible of cultivation in boyhood? He admits in I. I3. I260 a 13 sq. that boys possess the deliberative element of the soul, though in an imperfect form. Why then should not this element receive more cultivation in youth than Aristotle provides for it? Some kinds of mental work, again, fall well within the range of the boyish mind; yet Aristotle makes no provision for the training of those intellectual aptitudes which boys may well possess. Is it quite clear that even in the education of the body and the appetites training by habituation will suffice by itself without an admixture of training by reason? Another question may well be asked. Does Aristotle's scheme of education call for enough effort from the young? Is not their 'distaste for everything unsweetened' too much studied in it? Would not a training which gave them more difficulties to face and to conquer develope in them more force of will and be more really useful to them? Does not education largely consist in acquiring the power and the will to do that which is distasteful to us, when it ought to be done?

## ПО $\operatorname{ITTIK} \Omega \mathrm{N} \quad \Gamma^{\prime}$.

T仑̂ $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \epsilon ́ \pi \iota \sigma к о \pi о \hat{\nu} \tau \iota$, каi тís Є̀ка́ $\sigma \tau \eta$ каi 1274 b 32



 $\nu о \mu о \theta \epsilon ́ \tau o v \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu$ ò $\rho \hat{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \eta े \nu \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \epsilon i ́ \alpha \nu$ ov̂ $\sigma \alpha \nu \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$.




 $\pi \tau \epsilon ́ o \nu$. каì $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ ò mo入ít $\eta s$ á $\mu \phi \iota \beta \eta \tau \epsilon i \tau \alpha \iota \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \iota s^{\bullet}$ oủ







 $\nu \omega \nu 0 \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu^{*}$ каi $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \alpha u ̂ \tau \alpha$ тои́тols vi $\pi \alpha ́ \rho \chi \epsilon \iota^{\circ} \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha \chi o \hat{v} \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oûv

 коьv $\omega \nu i ́ a s), ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda \alpha ̀ ~ к \alpha \theta \alpha ́ \pi \epsilon \rho ~ к а i ~ \pi \alpha i ̂ \delta \alpha s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \mu \eta ́ \pi \omega ~ \delta i ̀ ~ \eta ̀ \lambda \iota-~$
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 Хоעтаs. ó $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ ov̂v $\mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau^{\prime}$ ă $\nu$ є́ф $\alpha \rho \mu o ́ \sigma \alpha s ~ \pi o \lambda i ́ \tau \eta s ~ \epsilon ́ \pi i ~$










































 $\phi \iota \sigma \beta \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \mu \alpha \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ́ \tau o u s ~ \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau i \nu ~ o u ̉ ~ \tau i ́ s ~ \pi o \lambda i ́ \tau \eta s, ~ \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \lambda ̀ ~ \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~$
















 Є้oıkє $\delta^{\prime}$ oik

















 $\alpha u ̛ \tau \eta े \nu ~ \epsilon i ̀ v a l ~ ф \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ o \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu, ~ к \alpha i ́ \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \alpha i \epsilon \epsilon i ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \phi \theta \epsilon \iota \rho о \mu \epsilon ́-~$

















 $\dot{\eta}$ тó入ıs, 入óyos ${ }^{\epsilon \prime} \tau \epsilon \rho o s$.














.30 diò $\tau \eta ̀ \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta ̀ \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma \kappa \alpha i ̂ o \nu ~ \epsilon i v a l ~ \tau o u ̂ ~ \pi o \lambda i ́ \tau o v ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \iota-~$





 $\theta \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \tau o ̀ v ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ v ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \alpha ́ \alpha i ́ \sigma \tau \eta s ~ m o \lambda ı \tau \epsilon i ́ a s . ~ \epsilon i ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ 5 ~$

































































 $25 \gamma$









 каì тoútovs $\theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in o \nu$ oîs $\mu \grave{\eta} \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \chi^{\omega} \nu$, oủX oîo $\nu \epsilon \pi \alpha \nu$ -









 $\kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \nu v ̂ \nu . ~ \eta ं ~ \delta ̇ \epsilon ~ \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i ́ \sigma \tau \eta ~ \pi o ́ \lambda l ı s ~ o u ̉ ~ \pi o \iota \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota ~ \beta a ́ v a v \sigma o \nu ~ \pi o \lambda i ́ \tau \eta \nu . ~$










 $\alpha i ̂ ~ \tau \iota \mu \alpha i ̀ ~ \delta i ́ \delta o \nu \tau \alpha \iota ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ к \alpha \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \xi i ́ a \nu{ }^{\prime}$ ov̉ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ oîóv $\tau^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi l \tau \eta \delta \epsilon \hat{v}-20$

 ( $\dot{\alpha} \pi \grave{o}$ $\tau \iota \mu \eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \cdot \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \quad \mu \alpha \kappa \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $\mu \in \theta \in \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota s \quad \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$ ),






 $\pi 0 \lambda i ́ \tau \alpha s ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \tau o l o u ́ t o u s ~(\delta \iota \alpha ̀ ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ o ̉ \lambda \iota \gamma \alpha \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i ́ a \nu ~ o u ́ \tau \omega ~ \chi \rho \omega ि \nu \tau \alpha \iota ~$



 $\gamma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota ~ \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \pi о \lambda i \tau \eta S$ ò $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \omega \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \tau \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, $̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ каì







 $5 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \in \lambda \epsilon i ́ a s$.











 тoùs $\pi \rho \omega ́ t o u s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v s, ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ o i ̂ s ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ o i k о \nu о \mu i ́ a s ~ \delta \iota \omega р i ́ \sigma \theta \eta ~ к а i ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon-~$








 $\kappa \alpha \rho \tau \epsilon \rho о \hat{\sigma} \sigma \iota \pi о \lambda \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ какота́ $\theta \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu$ oi $\pi о \lambda \lambda о \grave{\imath} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \epsilon \omega$
 $30 \gamma \lambda \nu \kappa u ́ \tau \eta \tau 0 s \quad \phi \nu \sigma \iota \kappa \eta ิ s . \quad \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \kappa \alpha i \quad \tau \eta ิ s \quad \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s \quad \gamma \epsilon$ тoùs



























 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ סíkaıov, ö $\sigma \alpha \iota$ ס̀̀ $\tau o ̀ ~ \sigma \phi \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \alpha ̉ \rho \chi o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$,















 $\alpha u ̉ \tau \eta S^{*}$ ö $\tau \alpha \nu$ ס̀ $\tau o ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ K o \iota \nu o ̀ \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon u ́ \eta \tau \alpha \iota ~ \sigma v \mu-$ $\phi \in ́ p o \nu, \kappa \alpha \lambda \epsilon i \tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ к о \iota \nu o ̀ \nu ~ o ้ \nu о \mu \alpha ~ \pi \alpha \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$,

 $1279 \mathrm{~b} \dot{\eta} \kappa \rho \iota \beta \hat{\omega} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \quad \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta \dot{\nu}, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \alpha ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ $\tau \eta े \nu \pi 0 \lambda \epsilon-$







 го oủ $\delta \epsilon \mu i ́ \alpha \alpha u ̛ \tau \omega ิ \nu$.
























 píous $\sigma v \mu \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa$ ós $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, тò $\mu$ èv $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ o ̉ \lambda \iota \gamma \alpha \rho \chi i ́ \alpha \iota s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \delta \grave{~} \tau \alpha i ̂ s$










 каì ঠŋךоккратías, каì тí тò סíkaıoע тó $\tau \epsilon$ ỏ $\lambda \iota \gamma \alpha \rho \chi \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu$



 єîval, каì $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ द́ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oủ $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ roîs $\dot{\alpha} \nu i ́ \sigma o t s$. oi
























 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \omega ิ \nu$ єí$\sigma \alpha \gamma \omega \gamma i \mu \omega \nu$ каì $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta o \lambda \alpha \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau 0 \hat{v} \mu \eta े \quad \dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \kappa \in i \nu$











 9 oủX oîos mottî̀ ả $\gamma \alpha \theta$ oùs kaì סıкaíous toùs mo入ítas. ö̃t סè











 коıข




 $\alpha u ̉ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \tau \hat{\eta} s \mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \delta o ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s \chi^{\alpha} \rho \iota \nu{ }^{\cdot} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha ̀ \alpha \alpha \hat{\alpha} \tau \alpha \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma-$







 $14 \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \alpha$ ठ̊̀ $\tau 0 \hat{v} \tau \in ́ \lambda$



 ${ }_{5}$ тolav́т $\eta \nu$ кoเv$\omega \nu i ́ \alpha \nu, ~ \tau o v ́ t o l s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \omega s ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \tau \epsilon \sigma \tau \iota ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon i ̂ o \nu ~ \hat{\eta}$


























 ${ }^{\epsilon \prime} \nu \alpha$ тò̀ $\sigma \pi$ ои
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 $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\eta} s \quad \kappa \alpha \theta \alpha \rho \hat{\alpha} s \quad \tau \eta े \nu \quad \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu \quad \pi o t \epsilon \hat{\imath} \quad \chi \rho \eta \sigma \iota \mu \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha \nu \quad \tau \hat{\eta} S$





 $\delta \in i ̄ ~ \delta \iota \delta o ́ v a l ~ \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \epsilon u ̉ \theta u ́ v a s ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu ~ i a \tau p o i ̂ s, ~ o u ́ \tau \omega ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda o u s ~ \epsilon ́ v ~$


















































 $\kappa \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} s \pi \alpha \rho \epsilon \kappa \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa v i ́ a s$ oủ ठıкаíovs.





































 $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \iota \sigma o ́ \tau \eta \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \beta \beta \tau \tau \hat{\sigma} \iota \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \omega \hat{\omega} \nu(\epsilon i \quad \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho$ oi $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$


















 $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s \delta^{\jmath}$ oủ $\pi \alpha ́ ⿱ ㇒ 日 勺 \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \delta \iota \kappa \alpha i ́ \omega s, ~ o i ~ \pi \lambda o u ́ \sigma \iota o l ~ \mu ̀ ̀ \nu \nu ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon i ̂ o \nu ~$







 $40 \tau \grave{\alpha} s$ ä $\lambda \lambda \alpha s$. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta ̀ \nu$ kai oi $\pi \lambda$ єíous $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \epsilon ́ \lambda \alpha ́ \tau \tau o u s . ~ 4 ~$ каì $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ крєíттovs каì $\pi \lambda о v \sigma \iota \omega ́ т \epsilon \rho о \iota ~ к \alpha i ~ \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i ́ o u s ~ \epsilon i \sigma i ́ v, ~ \omega ̀ s ~$






 $\delta i \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \pi o v \delta \alpha i ́ \omega \nu$ ả $\delta \delta \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ єîval, каi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ є́к $\alpha \sigma \tau \eta$





 тоѝs $\delta \iota \alpha \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau о \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha s ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i$ т $\hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$. $\delta^{\prime} \xi \alpha \iota \epsilon \nu \tau$












































 $\kappa \iota \sigma \mu o ̀ \nu$ ai $\begin{aligned} & \eta \mu о к р а т о v ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha \iota ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota s, ~ \delta i a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu ~ \tau o \iota \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \alpha i \tau i ́ a \nu . ~\end{aligned}$



 ס̀̀ каì тoùs＇Apyovaútas тòv＇Hрак入є́a ката入ıтєîv סıà



















 $\kappa о \pi \tau \epsilon \pi о \lambda \lambda \alpha ́ \kappa \iota \varsigma$ ．тò $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho o ́ \beta \lambda \eta \mu \alpha$ каӨ́̀дov $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha s 20$







 каì кá入入ıov тov̂ $\pi \alpha \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \chi o \rho o \hat{v} ~ \phi \theta \epsilon \gamma \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu$ є́ $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \epsilon l ~ \sigma v \gamma-$





 iat $\rho \in i ́ a s^{\cdot} \delta \in u ́ t \epsilon \rho o s ~ \delta \grave{~} \pi \lambda o \hat{v} s, a ̀ \nu \quad \sigma v \mu \beta \hat{\eta}, \pi \in \iota \rho \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau о \iota o u ́ \tau \omega$













 ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \nu \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$.
 $\tau \alpha \beta \hat{\eta} \nu \alpha \iota ~ к \alpha \grave{~} \sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~} \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ \alpha s^{*} \phi \alpha \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \nu \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \omega ิ \nu$







































 кòv $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \phi u \gamma \alpha ́ \delta \alpha s ~ \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi \rho о \epsilon \iota \sigma \tau \eta ́ к \epsilon \sigma \alpha \nu ~ ' A \nu \tau \iota \mu \epsilon \nu i ́ \delta \eta s ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$































































$$
\begin{equation*}
1285 \text { b } 27-1286 \text { b } \mathrm{I} 3 . \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$























 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon o ́ v \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \eta \eta_{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \nu \delta \rho \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau о \kappa \rho \alpha \tau i ́ \alpha \nu$
 $\pi o ́ \lambda \in \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \sigma \tau \circ \kappa \rho \alpha \tau i ́ \alpha \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ a s, \kappa \alpha i ̀ \mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \delta v \nu \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \omega s$ каì $\chi \omega \rho i s$















 $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu, \pi \omega ิ s$ " $\epsilon \xi \epsilon \iota ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu \omega \nu ; \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu$ каі

















1287a. 16 Пєрì ס̀̀ $\tau o v ̂ \beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega s ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ к \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \alpha u ́ \tau o v ̂ ~ \beta o v ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu ~ \pi a ́ v \nu \tau a ~$







































 1287 b oi iat $\quad$ oì ка́ $\mu \nu 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ä $\lambda \lambda$ дous iarpoùs каi oi $\pi \alpha \iota \delta o \tau \rho i ́ \beta a \iota ~ \gamma u-$
































 סєîv ó $\mu$ oícs. à $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oûv oi סıa $\mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau o v ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \beta \alpha \sigma \iota-35$











 $\beta \alpha \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon v \tau \grave{\nu}$ каì тí тò ảpıбтократıкòv каì тí тò то入ıтıкóv.













 oi $\tau \grave{\alpha} S$ ó入ıү $\alpha \rho \chi \iota \kappa \grave{\alpha} s$ каì $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ oi $\tau \grave{\alpha} s$ ס $\eta \mu$ ократıка́s ( $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \eta$
 VOL. III.











 $\epsilon i \nu \alpha \iota \kappa \alpha \tau^{\top} \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta \eta^{\prime} \nu, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \quad \delta \nu \nu \alpha \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \rho \chi \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$









5 [ $\dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha ́ \gamma \kappa \eta ~ \delta \partial ̀ \eta ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \mu ́ ́ \lambda \lambda ~ \lambda o \nu \tau \alpha ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \pi o \iota \eta ́ \sigma \alpha \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \eta ́-~$ кov $\sigma \alpha \nu \kappa \kappa ́ \psi \iota \nu]$

## $\Delta^{\prime}\left(H^{\prime}\right)$.









































$$
\text { D } 2
$$


































 $\left.\mu \eta \grave{\eta}^{\pi \epsilon \iota} \theta^{\circ} \mu \in \nu 0 S\right)^{\circ}$.





 о仑̂тol каì $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi \lambda \epsilon i ́ \sigma \tau \omega \nu ~ a ̈ \rho \chi o v \sigma \alpha \nu ~ \epsilon v ่ \delta \alpha \iota \mu о \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \tau \eta \nu$














 pov ó то入८т८kòs каi $\pi \rho \alpha \kappa \tau \iota k o ̀ s ~ \beta i ́ o s ~ \alpha i \rho \epsilon \tau o ̀ s ~ \eta ̀ ~ \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ o ̀ ~$















 т $\rho o ́ \pi o \nu ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \epsilon i ̂ \nu \alpha l ~ \mu o ́ v o \nu ~ \epsilon u ̉ \delta \alpha i ́ \mu o v \alpha ́ ~ \phi \alpha \sigma \iota \nu . ~ \pi \alpha \rho ' ~$




















 ${ }_{5}^{5}$ каì $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ § \eta ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i ́ o \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \beta o v \lambda о \mu \epsilon ́ v \omega \nu \nu ~ к \alpha i ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \beta о \nu \lambda о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$.





























 $\sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi \epsilon \omega s, \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau i ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda o s ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \alpha ́ \rho i ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a \nu ~ \sigma v \nu \tau \epsilon i ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu{ }^{*}{ }_{5}$ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ тoùs ó $\mu 0 \lambda 0 \gamma 0 \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \alpha s$ $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ đòv $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} S$ єival Bíov 3














































 $9 \pi \rho \dot{\alpha} \xi \in \omega \nu$ тoùs $\tau \alpha i ̂ s$ סıavoíaus $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \iota \tau \epsilon \in \kappa \tau о \nu \alpha s . \quad \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ oủ $\delta^{\prime}$








































 таút $\eta \nu$ á $\delta \dot{v} \nu \alpha \tau o \nu$ єîval $\mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \nu$ oủ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \alpha u ̉ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \gamma \alpha ́ \lambda \eta \eta ~ \tau \epsilon$


 $\kappa \alpha \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ oú $\delta \epsilon \mu i ́ \alpha \nu$ óp $\omega \mu \epsilon \nu$ ồ $\sigma \alpha \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu \quad \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ T o ̀ ~ \pi \lambda \lambda \eta \theta o s$.







$$
.35
$$ 35





 $\pi \lambda o i ̂ o \nu ~ o ̋ \lambda \omega s$, oưò̀ $\delta v o i ̂ \nu ~ \sigma \tau \alpha \delta i o l v, ~ \epsilon i s ~ \delta \epsilon ́ ~ \tau l ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \theta o s ~ \grave{~} \lambda \lambda \theta o ̀ \nu ~ o ̀ \tau \grave{\varepsilon}$


























































 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi \alpha ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \alpha \nu ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \epsilon u ̉ \pi о \rho i ́ \alpha \nu ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \alpha ̉ \nu \alpha \gamma к \alpha i ́ \omega \nu ~} \mu \in \tau \epsilon ́-$


 каì катえ̀ $\theta \alpha ́ \lambda \alpha \alpha \tau \alpha \nu \cdot$ каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \beta \lambda \alpha ́ \psi \alpha \iota ~ \tau о u ̀ s ~ \epsilon ́ \pi \tau \tau \iota \theta \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́-~$




 oi ठè $\pi \alpha \rho \in ́ X O \nu \tau \epsilon S ~ \sigma \phi \hat{\alpha} S$ aủrov̀s $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$ ả $\gamma o \rho \alpha ̀ \nu ~ \pi \rho o \sigma o ́ \delta o u ~$



 $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu, \check{\sigma} \sigma \tau \epsilon \mu \eta ́ \tau \epsilon \tau o ̀ ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o ̀ ~ \nu \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \ddot{\alpha} \sigma \tau v ~ \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \pi о ́ \rho \rho \omega ~ \lambda i ́ \alpha \nu$,



























 $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ' $E \lambda \lambda \eta \eta_{\nu} \omega \nu$ каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \alpha \nu ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ o i k o v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu, ~ ف ̀ s ~ \delta \iota \epsilon i ́ \lambda \eta-~$












 Tध́pas тàs $\delta v \nu \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \epsilon s ~ \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \alpha s . ~ \phi а \nu \epsilon \rho o ̀ v ~ \tau o i ́ v v \nu ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ \delta \iota \alpha-~$









$\sigma \grave{v} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ס̀̀ $\pi \alpha \rho \grave{\alpha}$ фí $\lambda \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \gamma \chi \in 0$.















 $\tau \omega ิ \nu \kappa \alpha \tau \grave{\alpha} \phi \dot{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu \quad \sigma v \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \omega ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ov̉ $\tau \alpha v ิ \tau \alpha ́ ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota ~ \mu o ́ p l \alpha ~ \tau \hat{\eta} S$ ő $\lambda \eta S$




























 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} s ~ к \alpha \theta$ ' aúтoùs Xpєías каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \alpha ́ s, ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \pi \tau о \nu$








 oî $\pi \alpha \rho \alpha \sigma \kappa \epsilon v \alpha ́ \sigma o v \sigma \iota ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \tau \rho о \phi \eta ̆ \nu, \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon \chi \nu i ́ \tau \alpha s, ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu a ́ \chi \iota-~$ $\mu \circ \nu$, каì тò єüTopov, каì iєpєîs, каì крıтàs т $\omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma к \alpha i ́ \omega \nu$ каì $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$.

 таs єîval каì $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o u ̀ s ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon \chi \nu i ́ \tau \alpha s ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s ~$



 $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \tau \omega \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \iota \nu \alpha ̀ s ~ \tau \iota \nu \omega ิ \nu$. $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ र̀े $\rho$ каi $\pi o t \epsilon \hat{\imath} ~ \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \pi o-~$











 $\lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \beta o v \lambda \epsilon v o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \sigma v \mu \phi \epsilon \rho o ́ v \tau \omega \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~$



















[^10]


 кaîov єîval toùs $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o u ̀ s ~ \delta o u ́ \lambda o u s ~ \grave{\eta} \beta a \rho \beta a ́ p o u s ~[\hat{\eta}] \pi \epsilon p เ o i ́-$











 ảєí, $\tau o ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \mu ́ ́ p o s) . ~ . ~$







 $\sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ \alpha \nu, \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ס̀ $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ ' I \tau \alpha \lambda i ́ \alpha \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \widehat{̣}} \pi \pi \lambda \alpha \iota o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \alpha$ тoú-






 Oiv aủтoîs $\theta$ '́ $\sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ к \alpha \grave{~ \tau \grave{\alpha}} \sigma v \sigma \sigma i ́ \tau \iota \alpha ~ к \alpha \tau \alpha \sigma \tau \eta ิ \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \pi \rho \omega ิ т о \nu . ~ \delta \iota o ̀ ~$

















 $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \hat{\alpha} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \zeta \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu$.

























 $\pi \alpha \rho \rho^{\prime}$ évíois vó $\mu$ os $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \gamma \epsilon i \tau \nu l \omega ̂ \nu \tau \alpha s ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ o ́ ~ \mu o ́ p o ı s ~ \mu \eta ̀ ~ \sigma v \mu-~$





































 таîs $\pi$ о入ıтєíals oîov ảкрóто入ıs ỏ̀ıуархıкòv каì $\mu о \nu \alpha \rho \chi \iota-$




 $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi \alpha \lambda \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \tau o u ̉ \nu \alpha \nu \tau i ́ o \nu, ~ \grave{\omega} s ~ \epsilon i ̂ X o \nu ~ k a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \alpha i ̂ o \nu ~ X \rho o ́ v o \nu ~{ }^{\circ}{ }_{25}$


 زoîs às ка入ov̂бí $\tau L \nu \in s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \epsilon ́ \lambda \omega \nu$ $\sigma v \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \delta \alpha s) ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{i} \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \mu ̀ ̀ \nu$








 $\tau \eta \hat{\eta} \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i ́ v \eta s$ каi $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ '̀v $\tau 0 i ̂ s ~ o ̉ \lambda i ́ y o \iota s ~ \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} S, \epsilon i \quad \delta \in \hat{\imath}$













 $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota ~ \pi \rho \epsilon \pi o ́ v \tau \omega s$ каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} s ~ \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \alpha ̀ s ~ \chi \rho \epsilon i ́ a s, ~ \tau \alpha ́ s ~ \tau \epsilon$



 тoîs $\epsilon \hat{\mathcal{U}} \pi \alpha \rho \in \sigma \kappa \in \nu \alpha \sigma \mu$ '́vois.





2 тoîs фu入актทрíos. кגì $\tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ $\mu$ èv $\delta \grave{\eta} \tau 0 \hat{\tau} \tau o \nu \stackrel{\alpha}{\nu} \nu \tau \iota s ~ \delta \iota \alpha-$













 $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa i ́ \alpha s ~ к \alpha \grave{\imath} ~ \tau o v ̂ \tau o \nu ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ к o ́ \sigma \mu о \nu, ~ к \alpha \grave{~} \pi \alpha \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon ́-~$





































 oưтє $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ ن ́ \pi т о к є i ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu ~ a u ̉ \tau o i ̂ s ~ o ̂ \rho o \nu ~ \tau v \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu o v \sigma \iota ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi o \iota \eta-~$


 $40 \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \epsilon S, \phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho o ́ \nu$, à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ тoút $\omega \nu$ тoîs $\mu \in ̀ \nu$ ' $\epsilon \xi$ ovaía $\tau v \gamma \chi \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$,















































































































 тô̂ фúбєı $\beta \in \lambda \tau i ́ o \nu o s ~ a i p \epsilon \tau \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a s ~ \epsilon i v a l ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \delta o v a \mu \epsilon ́ v o l s ~ \tau v \gamma-~$









 $\alpha u ̛ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu, \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ d̀̀ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \beta \in \lambda \tau i ́ \omega$ каì $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \in \lambda \eta$. $\tau o ̀ \nu ~ 14$ 40 aủ兀òv dè $\tau \rho o ́ t o \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \beta i ́ o u s ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~} \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \alpha ́-$

 $\nu \alpha \gamma \kappa \alpha i ̂ \alpha ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha}$ Х $\chi \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota \mu \alpha$ ס̀ $\pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ ठ̀̀ ка入̀े $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ $\mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$. $̈ \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ́ t o u s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \sigma к o \pi o u ̀ s ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \pi a i ̂ \delta \alpha s ~ \epsilon ̈ \tau \iota ~$




















 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \chi \rho \eta ̂ \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \nu o ́ \mu o t s, ~ \alpha ̉ \pi o \beta \epsilon \beta \lambda \eta ́ к \alpha \sigma \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \zeta そ ̂ \nu ~ K \alpha-25$











 'ُ $\mu \pi о \iota \epsilon \hat{\nu} \nu \delta \in \hat{\imath} \tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha$ $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \psi v \chi \alpha i ̂ s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \pi \omega \nu^{*} \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$









 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \beta \alpha \phi \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \phi \iota \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu$, $̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ò $\sigma i ́ \delta \eta \rho o s, \epsilon i \rho \eta \eta_{\eta} \nu$ ä $\gamma o \nu-$
 10 $\lambda \hat{\alpha} \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$.
15 'ETєì ס̀̀ tò av̉тò Té̉os єîval фаívєтal kaì koıv̂̂ kaì

 $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} s$ єis $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} s$ vimápX $\epsilon \nu \nu^{.} \tau \in ́ \lambda o s ~ \gamma \alpha ́ \rho$,







 $\delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi o \lambda i ́ \alpha \nu, ~ \phi i \lambda o \sigma o \phi i ́ \alpha s ~ \delta ̀ ~ \pi ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \sigma \chi o \lambda \eta ́ \nu, ~$


















 $\dot{\alpha} \gamma \alpha \theta \hat{\omega} \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\alpha} \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \delta_{\iota \alpha ́} \tau \iota \nu 0 s \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon-$




 $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \iota \nu, \delta \iota \omega ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \iota \pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu, \lambda o l \pi o ̀ \nu ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \theta \epsilon \omega \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \iota \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \pi \alpha \iota-$







 $9 \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \tau \eta \nu$, ${ }^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau \alpha \stackrel{\omega}{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ $\psi v \chi \eta ̀$









 $\tau 0 \hat{v} \sigma \omega ́ \mu a \tau o s \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \eta ̂ s$.







 ท̀ $\tau \alpha v ́ \tau \eta s ~ \mu e ̀ \nu ~ \tau o ̂ ̂ ~ \delta ’ ~ \alpha ُ \nu \delta \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu \eta ́ ~(\tau \alpha v ̂ \tau \alpha ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \pi o l \epsilon i ̂ ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma \tau \alpha ́-~$



 1335 a $\pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu$ ßón $\theta \epsilon \iota \alpha$ тoîs $\tau \epsilon \in \kappa \nu o \iota s)$, oưтє 入íav $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \gamma \gamma v s$ єîval


















 $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} s \nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \alpha s, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oú $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ к \alpha \rho \pi \omega ิ \nu ~ к о-$















 $\nu \hat{v} \nu$, ópí $\alpha \alpha \nu \tau \epsilon s$ X $\chi \iota \mu \hat{\nu} \nu 0 s$ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ $\sigma v \nu \alpha v \lambda i ́ a \nu ~ \pi o \iota \in ̂ i \sigma \theta \alpha \iota ~ \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu . ~$
 $\pi \alpha \rho \grave{\alpha} ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ i \alpha \tau \rho \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \lambda \epsilon \gamma o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ каì $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \alpha \rho \grave{\alpha} ~ \tau \widehat{\omega} \nu \quad \phi \quad \sigma \iota \kappa \widehat{\omega} \nu{ }^{4} 40$
 каì $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \nu \epsilon v \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ oi $\phi v \sigma \iota \kappa o i ́, ~ \tau \grave{\alpha}$ ßó $\rho \epsilon \iota \alpha \tau \omega ิ \nu \nu \circ \tau i ́ \omega \nu 1335$ b














VOL. III.

 volav toủvavtíov $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \dot{\rho} a \theta v \mu о \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega s$ á $\rho \mu o ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota$ סıá-





















 $40 \dot{\alpha} \pi \tau о ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \nu \phi \alpha i ́ \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \hat{\omega} s$, ő $\tau \alpha \nu \hat{\eta}$ каì $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \alpha \gamma 0-$



 форà $\nu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \sigma \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \delta u ́ v \alpha \mu \iota \nu ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~ \tau \rho о ф \eta ́ \nu, ~ о ́ \pi о i ́ a ~$








 $\pi \alpha i ̂ \delta \omega \nu^{*}$ то̂̃то $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ u ́ \gamma i ́ \epsilon \iota \alpha \nu ~ к \alpha i ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu ı к \alpha ̀ s ~$
















 $\pi \alpha \iota \delta o \nu o ́ \mu o v s . \quad \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \alpha \alpha \grave{\alpha} \rho \delta \in \hat{\imath} \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau o \iota \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \pi \rho o o \delta o \pi o l \epsilon i ̂ \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s$






































 таîs $\pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \alpha \iota s$ ảkoaîs. $\sigma v \mu \beta a i v \in \iota ~$ dè raủtò roûto kai $\pi \rho o ̀ s$
$\tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \pi \omega \nu$ ópl入ías каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu . ~$ $14 \pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha \quad \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \quad \sigma \tau \in ́ \rho \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \quad \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$. Sıò $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ тoîs



 ท̀入ıкíal $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ s ~ \grave{\alpha} \nu \alpha \gamma к \alpha i ̂ o \nu ~ \delta \iota \eta \rho \eta ̂ \sigma \theta \alpha l ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i ́ \alpha \nu, ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$



 $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \in ́ \chi \nu \eta$ каì $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i ́ \alpha ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \rho о \sigma \lambda \epsilon i \pi \pi o \nu ~ \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon \tau \alpha l ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \phi u ́-$



 $\pi o i ́ a \nu ~ \tau \iota \nu \alpha ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon \imath ̂ ~ \tau \alpha v ́ \tau \eta \nu$.

$$
\mathrm{E}^{\prime}\left(\Theta^{\prime}\right)
$$
























 35 Хрŋ̀ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in v \in \epsilon \theta \alpha \iota, \delta \in \hat{\imath} \mu \grave{\eta} \lambda \alpha \nu \theta \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$. $\nu \hat{v} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau \epsilon \hat{i}-$





 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta ̀ \nu$ خ̀ $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \alpha ́(\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha$ र̀े $\rho$ є̉̉ $\lambda \eta \phi \epsilon \tau \alpha \hat{v} \tau \alpha$ к $\rho \iota-$















## 1337 a $24-1338$ a 5. 7 I









 $\theta \alpha \sigma \iota, \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ каì $\gamma v \mu \nu \alpha \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu$ каi $\mu о \nu \sigma \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa \alpha i ̀ \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \alpha \rho$ -














 $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тóvov kaì $\sigma v \nu \tau 0 \nu i ́ a s)$, $\delta \iota a ̀ ~ \tau о u ̂ t o ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ \pi \alpha \iota \delta i a ̀ s ~ \epsilon i \sigma a ́ \gamma \epsilon-40 ~$








ПOAITIK $\Omega$ N $E^{\prime}\left(\Theta^{\prime}\right) . \quad 3-4$.


 $\tau \eta े \nu \alpha \dot{\alpha} \rho i \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ каì $\tau \eta े \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi o ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \lambda \lambda i ́ \sigma \tau \omega \nu$. $̈ \sigma \tau \epsilon \phi \alpha \nu \epsilon \rho o ̀ \nu$ ő $\tau \iota 6$
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 $\mu i ́ \alpha ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu o ̀ \nu ~ \grave{\eta} \pi \lambda \epsilon i ́ o u s, ~ \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau i ́ v \epsilon s ~ \alpha u ̂ \tau \alpha \iota ~ \kappa \alpha \grave{~} \pi \omega \hat{\varsigma}$, vi $\tau \tau \epsilon-$





oîo $\tau \eta ̀ \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ र $\rho \alpha \mu \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \mu \alpha ́ \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu, \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ каi $\delta i \alpha ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} s$

 $\mu \alpha \rho \tau \alpha ́ \nu \omega \sigma \iota \nu, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu \epsilon \xi \alpha \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \eta \tau o \iota ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta े \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \kappa \epsilon v \hat{\omega} \nu$
 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\tau \alpha}$ бढ́m $\mu \tau \alpha$ к $\alpha$ 入入















 $3 \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ тoîs $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o \iota s ~ \kappa \alpha i ~ \lambda \epsilon o \nu \tau \omega ́ \delta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu \quad \geqslant \quad \eta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$. $\pi о \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$
















 $\kappa \rho i v \epsilon \iota \nu, \alpha \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \epsilon \in \kappa \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \nu \hat{v} \nu$. $\dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \alpha \gamma \omega \nu \iota \sigma \tau \grave{\alpha} s$ रà $\rho \tau \hat{\eta} s \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i ́ a s$





































 $\mu \alpha \nu \theta \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon L \nu$ av่тоús, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta \grave{\eta}^{\kappa \alpha} \theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho$ oi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \Pi \epsilon \rho \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath}$


 $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ тобо仑̂тov X $\epsilon i$ ठ̀ $\delta \in i ̂ \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тoんav̂та $\delta \iota \alpha \pi o \nu \epsilon i ̂ \nu ~ \alpha u ̉ \tau o u ́ s, ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$






















 $\lambda \eta ̀ \nu$ ov̂ $\alpha \alpha \nu$ каì $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \quad \mu \in \lambda \omega \delta i ́ a s$ ( $\phi \eta \sigma \grave{\iota}$ रoû $\nu$ кai Movбaîos

























































IIOAITIK $\Omega N E^{\prime}\left(\Theta^{\prime}\right)$. 5-6.







 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu, \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \tau \alpha ̀ s ~ \mu \alpha \lambda \alpha \kappa \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \delta \iota \alpha ́ \nu o l a \nu$, oîov $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ $\tau \grave{\alpha} s \dot{\alpha} \nu \in \iota \mu^{\prime} \nu \alpha s, \mu \epsilon ́ \sigma \omega s$ ठ̀ $\kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ к \alpha \theta \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa o ́ t \omega s ~ \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~$

 $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i ́ \alpha \nu \tau \alpha u ́ \tau \eta \nu \pi \epsilon \phi i \lambda o \sigma \circ \phi \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \epsilon s^{*} \lambda \alpha \mu \beta \alpha ́ \nu 0 v \sigma \iota \quad \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \grave{\alpha}$


























 $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{̀} \nu}$ סıopíซal, каì $\lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha l ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \phi a ́ \sigma к о \nu \tau \alpha s ~ \beta a ́ v \alpha v-~$





 $\tau \hat{\eta} S ~ \mu o v \sigma \iota \kappa \hat{\eta} s ~ \beta a \nu \alpha u ́ \sigma o v s$, oủ $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \epsilon \pi}{ }^{\lambda} \nu ̀ \nu \lambda \hat{v} \sigma \alpha \iota ~ \sigma \kappa \in \psi \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ v o u s$
 $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \in v o \mu \epsilon ́ v o i s ~ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \eta ́ \nu, \kappa \alpha \grave{\imath} \pi о i ́ \omega \nu, \mu \in \lambda \widehat{\omega} \nu$ каi $\pi o i ́ \omega \nu \rho \dot{\rho} v-1341$ a





































 40 oîov $\pi \eta \kappa \tau i ́ \delta \epsilon s$ каì $\beta$ áp $\beta \iota \tau 0 \iota$ каì $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \grave{\eta} \delta о \nu \eta ̀ \nu ~ \sigma v \nu \tau \epsilon i ́ \nu о \nu \tau \alpha$














 $\nu \eta \rho o ̀ s ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ o ́ ~ \sigma K o \pi o ̀ s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ o ̂ ̀ \nu ~ \pi o l o u ̂ v \tau \alpha \iota ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \tau e ́ \lambda o s . ~ o ́ ~ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho{ }_{15}$
 каì тov̀s $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu i ́ \tau \alpha s$ тoùs $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a u ̉ \tau o ̀ v ~ \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \widehat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha s$ av̉тoús $\tau \epsilon$

 [каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i ́ \alpha \nu] ~ \pi o ́ \tau \epsilon p o \nu ~ \pi \alpha ́ \sigma \alpha \iota s ~ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ o \nu ~ \tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ a ́ \rho \mu о \nu i ́ a ı s ~$
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 11 ка⿱̀ тоútov $\pi \circ \lambda \lambda \alpha ̀ ~ \pi \alpha \rho \alpha \delta \epsilon i ́ \gamma \mu \alpha \tau \alpha ~ \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o v \sigma L \nu ~ o i ́ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \sigma u ́ v \epsilon-~$








$13 \Delta \omega ́ \rho \iota \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \eta \pi \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon v \in \sigma \theta \alpha \iota \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau 0 i ̂ s \nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o l s$. єioi









 '่ $\sigma \circ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa i \alpha \alpha \nu, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \nu \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu, \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \kappa \alpha i ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau o l o v ́-$







## CRITICAL NOTES.

## BOOK III.

1274 b 33 . Vet. Int. renders $\pi о \tau \epsilon$ by quidem, as in 1276 a 18 and 1286 a 1 . 40. Vet. Int. has et for $\delta \epsilon$, as in 129 I b 40, ßрахє́ $\omega \nu$ ס̀̇.

1275 a 11. каì $\gamma$ à $\rho$ тaûta тоúтoเs vimá $\rho \chi \in \iota$ om. $\Pi^{1}$. 19. $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ГП Vat. Pal. Bekk.: $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ Ar. Conring, Sus. See explanatory note.
 dered accusatio in 1264 a 27 and 1268 b I9, the two other passages of the Politics in which it occurs. סєó $\mu \in \nu=\nu]$ Vet. Int. opportunam, as in 1323 b 30 and in Rhet. 1. 2. 1357a 9 and 2.7. 1385 a 20 (Dittmeyer, Quae ratio inter vetustam Aristotelis Rhetoricorum translationem et Graecos codices intercedat, p. 50). 24. $\delta \iota \eta \rho \eta$ $\mu^{\prime} \nu a \iota$ ГП Vat. Pal. (Vet. Int. divisi): $\delta \iota \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ v a \iota$ Scaliger, Sus. See explanatory note on 1275 a 23. 27. ầ фain $\Gamma$ P $\mathrm{P}^{146}$ Vat. Pal., фaí $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$, ùv $\tau \iota \phi a i \eta \mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc. Göttling conj. ầ ảvtıфaiŋ. But in Eth. Nic. 3. 8. III7 a 14, where the MSS. have à $\downarrow \tau \iota \pi a \theta \epsilon i \nu$, Heylbut (Aspas. Comm. Praef. p. x) and Bywater accept âv $\pi a \theta \in i \nu \nu$ from Aspasius. See also Stallbaum's critical note on Plato, Gorg. 48 I D, where he restores $\hat{a} \nu \phi \hat{\eta}$ from the best MSS. in place of the
 secundum quod, which may represent $\dot{\eta}$ (see critical note on 1280 a 24), though qua is a more usual equivalent for it in Vet. Int. (see e.g. 1279 a II and 1286 a 23).

1275 b 7 . I follow Coray and Sus. in adding $\epsilon \mathcal{\nu} \nu$ before éviaus:


 sed, but this stands for $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ here, as in 1282 b 8 and 1323 b 36. 「àp om. $\mathrm{P}^{1} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{b}}$ and over an erasure $\mathrm{P}^{4}$. 16. àmоб́́́отає $\Pi$ : Vet. Int. attribuitur, as in 1299a 26. In 1285 a 6 ȧтоס́є́otat is rendered attributa sunt, but it is doubtful whether Vet. Int. found
$\dot{a} \pi$ rodiorat in $\Gamma$ in the passage before us and in 1299 a 26 ，for he renders $\pi \epsilon \in \pi o \nu \theta \epsilon$ by patitur in 1294 b 17 ．17． $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ omit the second $\pi \epsilon \rho$ ，but see critical note on 133I b 24 and explanatory note on 1284 a 35．21．$\delta \dot{\epsilon}]$ ］$\dot{\eta} \Pi$ Vat．Pal．Bekk．：all MSS．of Vet．Int．which have been examined but three（ hkz ）have etiam， which stands for $\delta \eta$ in 1277 b 16 and $1292 \mathrm{~b} 10 ; \mathrm{hkz}$ have autem． I follow Sus．in reading $\delta \dot{\epsilon}, ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu]$ Vet．Int．secundum usum：did he find катà in $\Gamma$ ？25．$\delta \dot{\epsilon} \Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ Sus．：ò̀ $\mathrm{P}^{3} \Pi^{3}$ Bekk．
 motov́s（eivaı ráp тıvas 入apıббoтotov́s ГП Vat．Pal．）is bracketed by Ridgeway and Sus．，and Camerarius（Interp．p．112）would read
 1275 b 26 ．32．$\eta \sigma a \nu \Pi^{1}$ Ald．Vat．Pal．Sus．and over an erasure $\mathrm{P}^{4}: ~ 弓 \exists \sigma a \nu$ ầ $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc．Bekk．кaì $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ ov̉ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{123}$ Vat．Pal．etc． Sus．${ }^{4}$ ：кaì yàp oủ $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ etc．Bekk．：Vet．Int．neque enim，which perhaps represents кaì үà oùठ̀̀．33．Є̇k om． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and perhaps $\Gamma$（Vet．Int． quod ex cive mare aut femina）．34．＇éxeivo Victorius et vir doctus
 et pr． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$（rasura super $\epsilon \iota$ ）et pr． $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ et corr． $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ ，éкєivol pr． $\mathrm{P}^{3}$（ut

 magis habent．35．Richards would add oûs after oiov，a sugges－ tion which well deserves to be recorded，though I am not sure that any change should be made in the text．39．käv Bekk．${ }^{2}$ Sus．： кai П Bekk．${ }^{1}$ It is not easy to say what Vet．Int．found in his Greek text，for he has equidem et cum hoc adhuc aliquis dubitabit：
 of ä้ by $\Gamma \Pi$ see critical note on 1283 b 14 ．тov̂tó L8 Ald．pr． $\mathrm{M}^{\varepsilon}$ Bekk．Sus．，тои́т $\boldsymbol{\Gamma} \mathrm{P}^{1234}$ ．

1276 a 4．$\tau \hat{\eta} s$ om． $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ：the reading of $\Gamma$ is of course uncer－ tain．5．є̈фацє $\mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．Sus．：фанє́ข Г Ms．14．каі סךцократоиิ̀таi тives］Vet．Int．in democratiam versae fuerunt（or fuerint）quaedam，a rendering which it is hard to explain．We cannot be sure that kai was omitted in $\Gamma$ ，for Vet．Int．often fails to render kai ：in may，however，stand for karà installed in the place of каi．Does versae fuerunt stand for є́трќтоуто repeated from ròv тро́тоу тоиิтоу？21．Sus．brackets tò̀ tómov кaì тoùs àvӨрळ́тous，but compare the similar repetition of tì x＇$\omega$ pav in 8 （6）．4．I3I9 a 33 （where Sus．brackets $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu)$ ，and of $\tau \omega \bar{\omega} \dot{\eta} \theta \bar{\omega} \nu$ in 5 （8）．5．ェ340 a 33 sq．（where Sus．brackets the first $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$ ）．25．тòv aủrò $\nu$ ］
tò̀ aùtò̀ tómov $\mathrm{P}^{\ddagger} 6$ Bekk. and possibly $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ (Vet. Int. cundem locum). As to additions of this kind in $\mathrm{P}^{46}$ see critical note on 1329 a .

1278 b 9. $\lambda$ ' $\gamma \quad \mu \epsilon \nu$ Albertus Magnus, Leonardus Aretinus, Morelius, Bekk., Sus. : 入évoupev r II. Should â be added after eitépav and $\lambda \epsilon ́ \hat{\gamma} \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ be retained? 14. $\mu \epsilon \tau a \beta a ̈ \lambda \eta]$ ] $\mu \tau \tau \beta a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \Pi^{3}$ Bekk.

 $r \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Ar., corr. ${ }^{3} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ (in paler ink than the MS.), and marg. $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ : $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$, however, is omitted in pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and supplied by the scribe in the same ink as the MS. ; it is also written above the line in marg. $P^{4}$ : we cannot be sure that it was added in $\mathrm{\Gamma}$. 36. $\begin{gathered} \\ \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \text { om. } \mathrm{M}^{8}\end{gathered}$ Vat. Pal. pr. P1, but not F (as Sus. says), for Vet. Int. has quin immo, which represents oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu a ̈ \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ in $127^{8} \mathrm{~b} 2 \mathrm{I}$ and 1323 b 6 . 39. aṽò̀ $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk., avтov Vat. Pal., aủrò̀ $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. ipsum):




1277 a 8. кт $\overline{\sigma t s}$ is bracketed by Bernays. See explanatory
 фаі̀vovaı пaıôevónevol] Vet. Int. videntur erudiri, which stands for
 Bekk.: oì $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. (Vet. Int. itaque). Vat. Pal. has eiofavin.
 same ink as the MS.): Vet. Int. has quando non tyrannizat, which probably represents ö̃ $\tau \epsilon \mu \grave{\eta} \tau v \rho a \nu \nu \in \hat{i}$. $\quad$ 26. After or (with Bernays) before $\delta o k i \mu u$ we should probably supply $\delta$ oкe $\hat{\imath}$ : compare the
 prefer this change to Dr. Jackson's ingenious suggestion of סoкєi

 Verschiedenes (lernen).' 'A $\mu \phi$ órefa from the next line, however, may perhaps have taken the place of é éepa. 32. тov̀vтevêev $\Pi^{2}$

 readings of Vat. Pal. (Rhein. Mus. 42. 103) does not note any variation in 34 from the reading of Sus. ${ }^{3}$ ( $\epsilon^{\epsilon}$ 'ouev, $\hat{a}$ ), but this may be an oversight. Sus. ${ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ takes the reading of Vat. Pal. here to be that of $\Gamma \Pi, \lambda_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{j} \dot{\mu} \mu \mathrm{eva}$. 39. aùroús] See explanatory note on 1277 a 38.

1277 b 2. $\pi \rho \grave{\nu} \delta \hat{\eta} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\sigma} \theta a t]$ Vet. Int. antequam fuisset demus. $\Gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota$ is rendered by fuisse in 1329 b 9 and by esse in 1288 a 16 ,
 1304 а 5. 14. ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ каі̀ "̈ $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : äp $\rho є \iota \nu$ каі̀ ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. See critical note on 1288 a 13 . The words are found in both orders (see e.g. 1284a 2, 1317b 2, 1277 a 26 sq., b 20).
 $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc., ä $\lambda \lambda \omega$ s Ald., äda ${ }^{2}$ os $\mathrm{P}^{4}$. See explanatory note on I 277 b 22 . коб $\mu i a$ ] z has ornata without any erasure (with ch klmn and rec. a), which is probably right, for коб $\mu \in \hat{\imath} \nu$ is rendered by ornare in Vet. Int. in 1323 b 3, 1314 b 37, and (in z) 132 I a 37 : b g Sus. ordinata. 29. $\check{\omega} \pi \pi \epsilon \rho$ aủ̀ototòs $\gamma$ à $\rho \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ रà $\rho$ aủגотоьò $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. $\Pi^{2}$ are probably right, for in. 1278 a $37 \Gamma \Pi$ have
 occurs in 1293 b 17 , where $\Pi^{2}$ have єis ảpєт $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon$ кaì $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu o \nu$ and

 ${ }^{7} 7$ and cp. also $\mathrm{I}_{3} 26 \mathrm{~b} 4$, where $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ have $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu \mu^{\mu} \nu$ roîs àvaүкaiots, and $\mathrm{P}^{234}{ }^{2} \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ тoîs $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ àvaykaiots.

1278 a 11. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\circ}$ àvaүкаí $\omega \nu$ ]. See explanatory note. 12.
 aj $\rho \tau \bar{\eta} s \Gamma$ Ms ${ }^{\text {s }}$. Vet. Int. has non participare virtute, but in a z the words principatu fortes interpres are added after virtute. It has not been pointed out that the three words are probably a corruption of 'principatu fortasse' interpres, a suggestion by the translator that principatu should be read in place of virtute, in which he was undoubtedly right. 32. Vet. Int. does not trans-
 which probably represents $\pi \rho \circ a \iota \rho o \hat{\nu} \tau a \iota\left(\mathrm{cp} .1325{ }^{\mathrm{b}} 25\right.$ and I34I b 26). Vet. Int. may have found this reading in $\Gamma$; it is more likely, however, that he misread his Greek text. 34. a $\sigma \tau \omega \nu$ Vat. Pal., $\dot{\mu} \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ codex Hamilton collated by Dr. H. Rabe, confirming a conjecture of Perizonius (ad Ael. Var. Hist. 6. го), aủt $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ Г $\Pi$. The two words are often confused in the MSS.: thus $\Pi^{1}$ have auvoús in place of ágroús in $6(4)$. 16. 1 300 b 32 , and in Oecon. 2. 1346 b 27 the MSS. have aưt $\omega$ in place of $\grave{a} \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu . \quad$ 36. Sus. ${ }^{3}$ a : ' $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \ldots 3^{S}$, $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \omega \nu$ post 40 , ধ̇ $\sigma \tau i \nu$ Vaticanum et pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ et corr. $\mathrm{P}^{4}, 37, \dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon i ́ \ldots$
 ordinem restituit corr. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ' (i. e. Demetrius Chalcondylas, the writer of $\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{\prime}}$, in the same ink as the MS.). 37. $\dot{\omega} \sigma \epsilon_{i}^{i}$ ] Vet. Int. ac si,
just as he has ac si for $\check{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \kappa a ̂ \nu$ in 1312 а 26．40．Schneider （followed by Sus．）may well be right in adding ảpєтìv after $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ aúrìv （cp．c．4．1277a 20，where $\Pi^{1}$ omit $\dot{a} \rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta}$ after $\dot{\eta}$ av̉ァウ̀），but $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta \dot{\nu}$ is omitted in I．13．1260 a 24 and 3．I3． 1283 a 40.

1278 b 1．є̇к $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \in \dot{\epsilon} \rho \eta \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu$ om．$\Pi^{1}$ ，but Vat．Pal．agrees with $\Pi^{2}$ in adding the words．3．ка́кєìvos $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．（Vet．Int．et ille）：Demetrius Chalcondylas，the writer of $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ，has first written ка̉кєivos and then corrected it to кảкєì ${ }^{\prime}$ s，adding，however，o above $\eta$
 cival кúpıos is added by $\Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ Vat．Pal．，but omitted by pr． $\mathrm{P}^{34}$（add． marg． $\mathrm{P}^{34}$ ）．7．кầ $\in i \Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．（кầ $\epsilon i \quad \pi \lambda \epsilon i ́ o v s$ om． $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ）：кai $\epsilon i$ $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．et si plures），but et si appears to repre－
 rıkais］ z has democratiis：the other MSS．of Vet．Int．democraticis． 14．rov́т $\omega \nu$ ］$z$ has horum ：the other MSS．of Vet．Int．corum． 15．$\delta \grave{\eta}$ ］$\delta \overline{\text { è }}$ pr． $\mathrm{Q}^{b}$ Bekk．17．$\delta \dot{\eta} \Pi^{2}$（except $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ ），Bekk．：$\delta \grave{\epsilon} \Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{4}$ Sus．Vat．Pal．has $\delta \eta$ ．кат̀̀ ］каі̀ ката̀ $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ corr． $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ Bekk．19．каі̀ ö́七 $\Pi$ Vat．Pal．Sus．，ö̃七 Bekk．：Vet．Int．fails to render кaì，but this he often fails to do（see vol．ii．p．lxiii）．$\quad \delta$ is added before ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi \sigma$ in $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus．（Vet．Int．homo leaves the reading of $\Gamma$ uncertain）： om．$\Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．：see critical note on 1253 a 2，and Stallbaum on
 $a ̉ \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu \quad \Gamma$（Vet．Int．ab invicem）：$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{a} a \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{\beta}} \Pi^{2}$ and pr． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ， also Vat．Pal．$\beta$ oп $\theta \epsilon i a s] \pi$ тлıтєias $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{8}$ Vat．Pal．$\Pi^{1}$ Vat．Pal．omit
 108，who urges that the meaning intended to be expressed by ouk
 totle＇s writings（e．g．in 2．6．1265 a 26，3．Ix． 1282 a 6 etc．），while ＂$\lambda a \pi \tau \sigma \nu$ on the contrary always means what is smaller in number，
 words are placed after aủrov̂ by $\Pi^{1}$ Vat．Pal．，but after $\mu$ ópıov by $\Pi^{2}$ ．


 $i \pi \epsilon \rho \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \mathrm{P}^{14}$ ：it is uncertain what reading Vet．Int．found in his Greek text，for his rendering is excedatur．30．$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta ̀ \nu ~ к a i l ~ \tau \eta ̄ s$ à $\left.\rho \chi \eta \hat{\eta}_{s} \gamma \epsilon\right] \mathrm{z}$ adds et before principatus，thus giving an equivalent for kai，which the other MSS．of Vet．Int．do not．$\gamma \in$ add． $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ Vat．Pal．40．$\left.\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho\right]$ $\omega s \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus．The reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain（Vet．Int，ut）．Vat．Pal．has $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ．$\Pi^{1}$ often omit
small words, and these MSS. (or at any rate $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ) omit $\pi \epsilon \rho$ also in 1317a 23.
 but not Vat. Pal. 12. aúroû $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ Ald. Bekk. Sus.: the other MSS. and $\Gamma$ aủrov̀. 20. кà̀ after $\pi \hat{a} \sigma a \iota ~ \Pi^{3}$ Bekk., but see explanatory note on 1281 a 26 . 25. тò $\pi v \lambda i \tau \epsilon v \mu a \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Vat. Pal. Sus.: $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. omit $\tau \grave{\text { : }}$ : the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain. 27. ö久íyous] z has paucos, but paucum, the reading of the other MSS. of Vet. Int., may perhaps be right, for $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ has $\dot{\delta} \lambda i \gamma o v . \quad 34$. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ before $\dot{\delta} \lambda i \gamma \omega \nu$
 Vet. Int. vivit (politice vivit? : cp. 1267 b 29, 1255 b 37).

1279 b 15. $\tau \iota$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but $\Pi^{1}$ often omit $\tau \iota s$ and its parts (see critical note on 1288 a 16). 22. 中 $\sigma v \mu \beta a i \nu \eta \dagger] \sigma v \mu \beta a i v \eta \mathrm{Ms}^{5} \mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc.: $\sigma v \mu \beta a \iota \nu \eta \iota$ Vat. Pal.: $\sigma v \mu \beta a i \nu \eta$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ : $\sigma \nu \mu \beta a i \nu \epsilon \iota \mathrm{P}^{14}$ Bekk. $^{2}$ Sus. (compare the reading of these two MSS. in $1278 \mathrm{~b}_{27}$ ). Vet. Int. accidat, which might stand for either reading (see critical notes on 1253 a 22, b 26). See explanatory note on 1260 b 3I. Meister (Das Colonialrecht von Naupaktos, p. 291 sqq.) defends the use of $a i$ with the subjunctive ( $a \dot{a} \dot{a} \nu \chi o \rho \epsilon \epsilon \in=a \dot{a} \dot{a} \nu \chi \omega \rho \epsilon \in \eta$ ) in a Locrian inscription from Naupactus (Hicks, Manual, No. 63: Cauer, Delectus Inscr. Gr., ed. 2, No. 229), but the verb is there used, as he remarks, in a future sense, which is hardly the case here, and even if this were otherwise, the difference of dialect would have to be taken into account. 26. кảv $\tau \iota s \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal. Bekk.: e’áv $\tau \iota s$ $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}}$ : Vet. Int. si quis, which may represent either éáv $\tau \iota s$ or кả้ $\tau \iota s$,
 tıs Sus. 28. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma o \rho \epsilon$ ற́n Morelius Bekk.: $\pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma o \rho \epsilon \cup ́ \epsilon \iota ~ V a t . ~ P a l . ~$ $\mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{T}^{\mathrm{b}}$ Ald.: $\pi \rho \circ \sigma a \gamma o \rho \in \dot{u} \boldsymbol{o} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{123}$ etc. Sus. : we cannot tell from Vet. Int. appellet what was the reading of $\mathrm{\Gamma}$. 32. Sylburg and Bekker add oi before єüropoı. 38. Sus. adds $\delta i a ̀$ after $\sigma \nu \mu \beta a i v \epsilon \iota$
 note. 39. $\gamma i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \Pi: ~ \gamma i \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ V a t . ~ P a l . ~$
 explanatory note on 1275 a 32 . For similar transpositions cp . 1277 a 1 (ả $\rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \mu \dot{a} a \Pi^{1}: \mu i ́ a d \dot{a} \rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal.), 1281 a 27 ( $\phi a \hat{\lambda} \alpha a$





 бхи́naatı $\Pi^{1}$ ). See critical note on 1282 a 40, and cp. 13 II a 22 ,



 $\theta$ epıo with the first $\iota$ above the line Vat. Pal., è $\lambda \in \dot{v} \theta \in \rho o \iota \mathrm{P}^{1}$. Sus. ascribes the introduction of ${ }^{\dot{e} \lambda} \lambda \in \theta$ epia into the text to Vict., whose first edition appeared in ${ }_{5} 55^{2}$, but Sepulveda's translation, which appeared in 1548 , already has the rendering ut libertate (p. 83 b). 28. ไ̌ov] Vet. Int. aequum, not aequale: so ex aequo stands for $\epsilon \xi$ đ̛ov in I3I8 a 8. 29. $\mu \nu \omega ิ \nu$ П Vat. Pal.: Vet. Int. talentis, though

 we cannot tell from Vet. Int. intulit what the reading of $\Gamma$ was.
 (Meisterhans, Gramm. der att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. 147). 31. тô̂ $\zeta \eta \nu]$ Vet. Int. ipsius vivere: for this rendering of the article cp. 1286 b 19, where ipsam multitudinem stands for $\tau \grave{2} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{0}$, 1290 a 34, $1292 \mathrm{a} 12, \mathrm{I} 301 \mathrm{~b} 34$, and many other passages. See critical



 The form Tupppukós appears in an Attic inscription of в.c. $350-$ 300 (Meisterhans, p. 76).

1280 b 2. тov̂ om. Ms $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ Vat. Pal. and perhaps $\Gamma$, possibly rightly: Vet. Int. neque quales quosdam esse oporteat alteros alteri curant. 4. $\left.\left.{ }_{\xi} \xi \epsilon\right]\right]_{\xi} \xi \in \epsilon \mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc. : ${ }_{\xi}{ }_{\xi} \epsilon \epsilon \Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{4}$ Vat. Pal. The mistake is a frequent one: see critical notes on 1283 a 7 and 1286 a 30 .
 Vet. Int. iniuste agant what was the reading in r , for Vet. Int. has
 тov̀oıv pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ (corrected in a paler ink than the MS.), ס̌akovov̂ $\iota \iota$
 See critical note on 1262 a 29. In 'A $\theta$. Пo入. c. 22, 1. $28{ }_{\alpha}{ }^{3} \pi \omega \theta \in \nu$ is the form used. 10. $\sigma v \mu \mu \not ́ \chi \propto \nu ~ Г ~ I I ~ V a t . ~ P a l . ~ B e k k .: ~ \sigma v \mu \mu a \chi \iota \omega \nu ~$ Conring, Sus. See explanatory note on 1280 b 8 . 13. ${ }^{\text {ovpayá- }}$ you] quváyou $\Pi^{3}$ Bekk. So in 1317a $3^{6} \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly r have quváyelv, $\Pi^{2}$ ${ }^{\text {ovvayafeiv. 18. ä } \pi o \theta \in v] \text { See critical note on }}$

1262 a 29，where，however，Vat．Pal．should have been stated to have $a \pi \omega \theta \epsilon \nu$ here，not $a \pi o \theta \epsilon \nu$ ．19．єї $\eta \sigma a \nu \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Vat．Pal．：$\epsilon i \begin{aligned} & \eta \\ & \eta \\ & \\ & \text { a }\end{aligned}$ the other MSS．and $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．si essent）．23．$\pi$ ov II Vat．Pal． and probably $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．quidem，which represents $\pi ⿰ 丿 ⺄ ⿱ ㇒ ⿺ 丄 丅 八$ in 1274 b 33 and $\pi \omega s$ in 1286 a 12）：$\pi \omega$ Ar．Bekk．Sus．30．$\dot{\eta}$～óncs oủk
 34．$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon ́ u s \mathrm{M}^{\circledR} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Vat．Pal．Sus．：$\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ éas $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．：the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain．35．каї Г П ：$\eta$ Vat．Pal．37．фратрiá］See critical note on 1264 a 8．40．$\delta \hat{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \Gamma \Pi$ Vat．Pal．：$\delta \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}$ or $\delta \dot{\eta}$ Sus．

1281 a 3．גápı̀ $\Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．Bekk．：om．$\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ pr． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ．Sus． brackets it．16．$\gamma \grave{a} \rho \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．Bekk．Sus．：$\gamma \grave{a} \rho a ̂ a \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}(\mathrm{z}$ omits utique representing $\hat{a} \nu$ ，but probably wrongly）．17．$\chi \rho \eta \Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．Bekk．：$\delta \in i ̂ M^{s} P^{1}$ Sus．：we cannot tell from Vet．Int． oportet which reading he found in his Greek text，for in 1263 b 30 and 1289 a I oportet represents $\chi \rho \dot{\eta}$ and in 1342 b 15 oportere represents $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \nu a u$ ，while oportet often elsewhere represents $\delta \epsilon \hat{i}$（e．g．in $1262 \mathrm{~b} 2-7$ ）．In 1335 b 28 again $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ have $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ and $\Pi^{2} \chi \rho \eta$ ．$\lambda \eta \phi \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \tau \omega \nu \Gamma \Pi$（Vet．Int．acceptis）：$\lambda \epsilon \iota \phi \theta \epsilon \nu \tau \omega \nu$ Vat．Pal．
 does not give breathing or accent．Sus．ascribes the reading тav̉rà to Vict．and Lamb．followed by Montecatino，and it is true that Vict．and Lamb．have haec eadem and Montecatino （vol．iii．p． 13 3）eadem，but I find the rendering＇li medesimi danni＇ （＇the same losses＇）in Bernardo Segni＇s Italian translation of the Politics（p．147，ed．r549），which was published before either of Victorius＇editions or the translation by Lambinus ap－
 Sus．See critical note on 1280 a 15 ．28．dixata $\Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \dot{\eta} \nu]$ These words are placed after ả̀ $\lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu o ́ \mu o \nu ~ \phi a \hat{\lambda} \lambda o \nu$ in $\mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Vat．Pal．Bekk．，but before these words in $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ M ${ }^{\mathrm{s}}$ ．Sus．${ }^{3}$ a （1894）places the words in the following order－à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$＂ैows фain $\tau \iota s$
 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau i j \nu} \psi \nu \chi \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{u} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu o ́ \mu o \nu$. But the order of $\mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{3}$ Vat．Pal． seems to me preferable．No doubt it interposes ảdג̀̀ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu o ́ \mu o \nu$
 note on 1276 a 28 ．41．סó $\epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ à $\nu \dot{\nu} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．］See explanatory note on 1281 a 40.

1281 b 1 ．ov̉ $\Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{4}$ ，ó $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc．5．ซvעє $\lambda \theta \delta \dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu \Pi^{1}$ pr． $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ Sus．， avvєдӨórras $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ etc．，corr．${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{23}$（same ink as MSS．），Bekk．7．rà
$\pi \epsilon \rho i \tau \grave{a} \eta \ddot{\eta} \theta \eta \Gamma$ in place of $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{a} \eta{ }_{\eta} \theta_{\eta}$ (Vet. Int. quae circa mores). $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{l}$ is added before $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ סtávolav by $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}}$ and perhaps by $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. circa intellectum), but this is not certain, for Vet. Int. often repeats prepositions (see critical note on 1253 a 36 ). 8. крivovat $\nu$ ] крíns


 $\left.\pi о \lambda_{\epsilon \mu i \omega \nu}\right]$ Vet. Int. seditionis. 42. $\boldsymbol{o}$ is added before iarpós in $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ followed by Sus.: the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain (Vet. Int. iste autem est medicus). $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ are probably wrong: see explanatory note on 1253 b II and Bon. Ind. 546 a 51 sqq., and cp .
 ảp $\chi \grave{\eta} \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$.

1282 a 5. кai is placed not after but before totov̀тoь in $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, followed by Sus.: Vet. Int. does not render it in either place. The authority of $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ unsupported by $\Gamma$ is small, and it is probably better to follow $\Pi^{2}$ and to place кai after тotov̂тo, taking it to mean 'in connexion with wellnigh all the arts, as well as in connexion with the medical art.' 7. кaì om. $\Pi^{1}$, but кai is very frequently omitted in $\Pi^{1}$. 10. єi $\gamma$ à $\rho$ кai] Vet. Int. et enim si, which probably stands for $\epsilon i$ үàp кaì and not for кaì $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \epsilon i$, for et si stands for $\epsilon i$ kai in 1282 b 38 and 1322 b 8 . 11. As to ov̉ $\tau \iota$ see explanatory note on 1282 a 10 . 17. $\Pi^{1}$ om. $\hat{\eta}$ before $\beta \in \lambda$ tious, but these MSS. are apt to omit $\bar{\eta}$ when it is followed by a second $\eta$, as in the passage before us. This happens in 1268 a 6,1324 b 30,1298 b 32 , and 1305 a 32 , as well as here. The same thing holds also of kai. See also critical note on 133 I b 24. 18. $\mu$ óvò $\Pi$ : $\mu$ óvos $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. solus). Sus. ${ }^{12} \mu$ óvos, Sus. ${ }^{34}$

 Bekk.: $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \iota \sigma \tau o \iota \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$, $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \iota \sigma \tau a \iota \mathrm{P}^{14}$, $\mu \epsilon ́ \gamma \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \Gamma$ Sus. (Vet. Int. maxima). $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \nu$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$, though Vet. Int. has in quibusdam politios (see critical note on 1275 b 7). 32.

 $\pi \dot{a} \nu \tau \omega \nu$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, and probably also $\Gamma$, for Vet. Int. does not render it, though he renders тò before $\tau \omega ิ \nu . \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \tau u v ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ \Pi \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.:
 $\Gamma$ Ms $\tau$ ои́т $\omega \nu \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$. $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ тои́т $\omega \nu$ is the more usual and less emphatic order (see Class. Rev. 10. 106), but $\Pi^{1}$ have a leaning
to inversions of this kind (see critical note on 1280 a 15 ). Taûta távza ('every one of these things') is used when emphasis is called for (e.g. in 1268 b 3, 128 I a 13 , 129 I a 16 , r309 a 39 , 132 I b 38), which does not seem to be the case in the passage before us.

1282 b 5. $\delta \iota o p i \sigma a \iota ~ \Pi^{1}$ Sus. (Vet. Int. determinare): $\delta \eta \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. $\Pi^{1}$ are probably right: cp. 1287 b 16 sq. 8. каі̀ $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk., кä̀ $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus.: Vet. Int. si (which however a b z Alb. omit) may perhaps stand for $k \neq \downarrow$, as in $1279 \mathrm{~b} 26,1298 \mathrm{~b} 23$, and 1309 b 9 . 15. $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk., ờ $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. (Vet. Int. itaque).

1283 a 4. $\left.\mu \hat{u} \lambda \lambda_{0 \nu}\right]$ See explanatory note. 7. ímє $\epsilon \in \notin \epsilon \iota$ corr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. excedit): iлє $\rho \epsilon_{\chi \epsilon \iota \nu}$ the rest. But the addition of a final $\nu$ is a common error of the MSS. (see critical notes on 1280 b 4 and 1286 a 30 ). 8. I follow Sus. in bracketing $\mu \dot{\gamma} \gamma \epsilon \theta$ Os : see explanatory note on 1283 a 6.10. kai om. $\Pi^{1}$, but see critical note on 1282 a 7 . 11. ảvєór $\eta \tau^{\prime} \Pi^{2}$,
 in a paler ink), iбór $\eta \tau a$ or iбór $\eta \tau^{\prime} \Gamma$ (Vet. Int. aequalitatem). 17. $\tau^{\prime}$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. does not render $\tau \epsilon$, but then he seldom does so). 27. "'ซov $\Pi^{1}$, " $\sigma \omega \nu \mathrm{P}^{2}$ ('ut videtur,' Sus. ${ }^{1}$ ) $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ etc. 32. זà om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ : we cannot tell from Vet. Int. ad conventiones what was the reading in $\Gamma$. 36. oikoı] Vet. Int. habetur. 37. ò $\bar{\eta} \Pi$ : of Susemihl's MSS. of the Vet. Int. only two ( g k ) have autem representing $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, while five have etiam, which stands for $\delta \dot{\eta}$ in 1275 b 21 , 1277 b 16 , and $1292 \mathrm{~b} 10: \mathrm{z}$ has autem etiam. Sus. seems to go too far in assuming that $\Gamma$ had $\delta \epsilon$.

1283 b 2. $\tau \iota$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but $\Pi^{1}$ often omit $\tau \iota$ and its parts (see critical note on 1288 a 16 ). 14. $\delta$ ógatє $\gamma$ jà $\rho(a ̀ \nu)]$ סógatev $\gamma$ à $\rho \Pi^{2}$,

 be right, for $\delta o ́ \xi a \iota$ (opt. of $\delta о к \epsilon i v)$ ) occurs in 3.4 .1277 b 21 , and סógalev
 Coray Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. $\Pi^{1}$ omit $\neq \nu$ in 1267 a 40 , 1297 a 41 , and 1313 a 20 ; it is not therefore surprising that $\Gamma \Pi$ should now and then omit it. See Bon. Ind. 4 I b 4 sqq. 20. тoûro "̈ $\sigma \omega \mathrm{s}$ or toût' "ઢ $\sigma \omega s \Pi^{2}$, rov́roıs $\Pi^{1}$, but here $\Pi^{1}$ omit the last syllable, as (e. g.) in 1276 b 20

 cannot tell from Vet. Int. exhiberi what was the reading in r . For other variations of a similar nature sce Susemihl's apparatus criticus on 1260 b 36,1267 a 35 , 1332 b I, and 1317 a 36 . 19. aṽтat
 though Vet. Int. has hae enim utique persecuntur, тav́тas $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \delta \in i ̂ ~ \delta \iota \omega ́ \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\mathrm{P}^{1}$, where tav́ras and $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ are in all likelihood conjectural emendations of Demetrius Chalcondylas, the writer of the MS., intended to remedy the flaw caused by the omission of $\delta$ oкov $\sigma \iota$ in the arche-
 scilicet prohibere). колои́єє $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and marg. $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ : к $\omega \lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \iota \nu$ the rest and Г. 41. $\pi a \rho a ̀ \Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{4}$, the rest $\pi \epsilon \rho i$.

1284 b 11. $\tau \iota$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but see critical note on 1288 a $16 . \quad 13$. $\mu o v a ́ \rho \chi{ }^{\text {ovs }} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk., $\mu$ ovápхas $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. (Vet. Int. monarchas). 20.
 enim, as in 1328 a 5 and probably in 1303 a II. 31. áşıôє $\mathrm{P}^{1}$
 Vet. Int. adds et before videtur, his equivalent for ëoıкє, but see critical notes on 1252 a 25 , 1262 a 29 , and 1264 a 9. 40. $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$
 Sus. (Vet. Int. unum aliquod genus). à̉ரท̂s $\Pi^{1}$ Bekk. Sus., aủ่ $\omega \hat{\nu} \Pi^{2}$.

1285 a 6. rovs om. Ms $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ : the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain. $\Pi^{1}$ often omit the article. 8. aùтократóp $\boldsymbol{1}$. Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ : the translation of Vet. Int. is ducatus quidam exercitus imperialis, and hence Vict. Schn. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ and Sus. read au̇тoкрát $\omega \rho$, though it is just possible that imperialis is in the genitive in agreement with exercitus and represents
 Leonardus Aretinus does not translate these words. His rendering is (MS. Ball. 242), vitae enim necisque alicuius non habet potestatem, nisi dum bellum gerit, ut etiam apud antiquos fuisse videtur. Nor does Giph. translate ${ }_{\epsilon \prime \nu} \nu \tau \iota \nu \iota$ ßaбı $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \epsilon \dot{a}$. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ brackets the
 word may easily have been repeated from $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda$ cia two lines above, but on the whole I incline to retain it (see the explanatory note for
 in place of $\epsilon \stackrel{\epsilon}{\nu} \tau \iota \nu \iota \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a$, , while Jackson would omit these words

 omit promptus, which is probably an alternative reading for potens,
 two alternative renderings of крєirtov (melior and valentior) have together found their way into the text of Vet. Int. ó $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \dot{a} \gamma a \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \nu \omega \nu$ $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : à $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \nu \omega \nu$ रà $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus.: we cannot tell from Vet. Int. Agamemnon enim which reading he found in $\Gamma$. The reading of
$n^{2}$ is probably right, the Agamemnon of the epic being referred to: Bywater adds тoû before ${ }^{7}$ Eктороs in Eth. Nic. 7. I. 1145a 20. Cp.

 and $\Pi^{1} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$. 13. $\left.\mu \dot{a} \chi \eta s\right] \nu o \eta \dot{\sigma} \omega$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$, $\mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \eta s \nu 0 \eta \sigma \omega$ corr. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ (in the same ink as the MS.) : Vet. Int. quem ego videro fugientem e proelio. Here $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ appear to complete the sense from a gloss. 18. $\pi a \rho a-$ $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma i a \nu] \pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \eta \sigma i \omega s \mathrm{P}^{46}$ etc. pr. $\mathrm{P}^{2}$. 19. тvpavעítı, єioi $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$ кai катà Sus., тvpapvíбı каì катà $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$, тvpavviбı катà $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and a corrector of $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ in paler ink than the MS., tupavyı and after a lacuna кaтà $\mathrm{P}^{3}$

 A short lacuna evidently existed in the archetype of the best MSS., and this has been filled up (perhaps conjecturally) in $\mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{8} \mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{D}^{\mathrm{b}}$
 Sus.: we cannot tell from Vet. Int. patria which reading he found
 or $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau о \iota a u ́ \tau \eta \nu$ (Vet. Int. talem). 35. $\mu \iota \tau v \lambda \eta \nu a \hat{o}$ П. The MSS. have $\mu \tau \tau v \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \eta, \mu \tau \tau v \lambda \eta \nu a \hat{o} o \iota$ in almost every passage of Aristotle's writings in which these words occur: Rhet. 2. 23. 1398 b $\mathbf{1 2}$, however, is an exception, for there the best MSS. have $\mu v \tau i \lambda \eta v a i ̂ o . ~$ Pr. $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ has $\mu v \tau i \lambda \eta \dot{\nu} \eta \nu$ in 1304 a 4 . Пıтлакò $]$ фıттакó̀ $\Pi^{1}$ and also in 38 and 39. In 1274 b 18 all MSS. have $\pi$ tivakòs. The form Фittakoc appears on imperial coins of Mytilene (Head, Hist. Num. p. 488). $\Phi$ sometimes takes the place of $\Pi$ in Attic inscriptions; thus in some of them we find the form фap $\theta_{\text {évos in }}$ in place of тap日évos (Meisterhans, Gramm. der att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. 79). As to the same confusion in MSS. see Mr. T. W. Allen in Journ. Hell. Studies, 15.299. 36. фuरáoas] The reading profugas in Vet. Int. is probably right, for a stands alone in reading profugos ( z has profugas.): ср. 1303 а 35. 39. тòv какотáтрıঠ́a Пıттакòv к.т.ג.] See explanatory note.

 note is (p. 99), 'herilia, quoniam tyrannica. Sic legitur in graecis exemplaribus quaecunque mihi videre contigit, sed lectio videtur esse transposita, quae commodius habitura videretur, si sic essettyrannica, quoniam herilia.' There is little doubt that he is right : compare the corresponding sentence 1285 a 23 sq. and also 6 (4).

(Ms éxov́бin九 тє) киі̀ пи́трьo $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus.: we cannot tell from Vet. Int. voluntariae et patriae which reading he found in $\Gamma$. The fem. form éкoious is more commonly used in Aristotle's writings than érovaia
 Greek literature generally (Kühner, Ausführl. gr. Gramm., ed. Blass, I. 537), but $\mathrm{K}^{\mathrm{b}}$ has ékov́atat in Eth. Nic. 3. 7. III4 b 24, кaì
 603 C, and exovaia in Plato, Laws 925 A. The fem. form $\pi a \tau \rho i a$ is also less often used in Aristotle's writings than $\pi$ árpıos (in 1285 a 33 all MSS. have $\pi a ́ \tau \rho \iota o s)$, but in $7(5) .5 .1305$ a 28 all MSS. have $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ татрias ঠпиократias. Plato uses the fem. тáтрıą in Laws 759 A. 7. $\pi$ opioai] Vet. Int. emerunt, which probably represents $\pi \rho i a \sigma \theta a t$,
 and so in 16 ov́riat $\Pi^{1}$ for $\theta v \sigma i a t$, readings which indicate that the archetype of these MSS. was written in uncial characters (see Sus. ${ }^{1}$ p. xiv, and critical notes on 127 I a 27 and b 25 ). 12. ধ̇mavátaбıs $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ Ald. corr. $\mathrm{P}^{3}$, є́naváataбıs $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{14}$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ : we cannot be sure from Vet. Int. elevatio which reading he found in $\Gamma$, but perhaps he
 insurrectio. 13. кaì тà karà $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu] ~ S e e ~ e x p l a n a t o r y ~ n o t e . ~ 16 . ~$ $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ adds ai $\pi a ́ \tau \rho \iota a \iota$ and $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ai $\pi a ́ \tau \rho \iota \iota \iota$ before ov̉ซiaı, which wrongly takes the place of $\theta$ voiar in $\Pi^{1}$, and Vet. Int. has patriae substantiae:
 at Athens, who was more or less the representative of the ancient kings, had to do with $\pi$ átpiot $\theta v \sigma i a t$, we, see from 'A $\theta . \Pi o \lambda . c .57: \mathrm{cp}$. Plato, Polit. 290 E. But whether these two words are rightly added by $\Pi^{1}$ before $\theta v \sigma i a t ~ i s ~ d o u b t f u l . ~ T h e ~ l a n g u a g e ~ o f ~ P l u t a r c h ~$ in Quaest. Rom. c. 63 makes rather in favour of their omission-


 (these MSS., for instance, are undoubtedly wrong in omitting $\mu \eta$ in 1335 b 25 and in reading ai for airiat in 1304 b 6 ), and I incline on the whole to accept the reading of $\Pi^{1}$ here, though it is no
 rest ${ }_{\omega} \rho \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu, \quad \tau \epsilon$ is added after $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma^{\prime}$ ós in $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, and possibly was added in $\Gamma$ also, but this is uncertain, for, as usual, Vet. Int. gives no rendering for it. $33 . \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon o ́ v \omega \nu ~ \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ corr. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{23}$ (i. e. corrections in $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ in the same ink as the MSS.): $\pi \lambda$ eionos $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \Pi^{2}$. 36. $\pi a \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a s$ ] $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a s ~ \Pi^{1}$, but $\Pi^{1}$ occasionally omit the first

VOL. III.
syllable of words，e．g．in 1342 b 32 （ $\delta$ áávotav for $\pi a \iota \delta \in i a \nu$ olov）and

 1285 b 39 ＇（Bon．Ind． 456 a 24）．

1286 a 1．тотє is added after $\pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о \nu ~ i n ~ \Pi^{1}$（Vet．Int．quidem， which represents $\pi o \tau \epsilon$ ，for $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ пoт $\epsilon$ is rendered qualiter quidem in 1276 a 17 ）．It is probably a blundered dittography of mórepov． 9．ठoкov̄ə the third Basle edition of Aristotle，followed by Bekker ： סокєî $\Gamma \Pi$ Sus．，who prefers（with Göttling）to correct oi vópot，the reading of $\Gamma \Pi$ in the next line，to $\delta$ vópos．Either change may be right ：that of Bekker avoids the transition from $\nu \dot{o} \mu \omega \nu, 9$ ，to $\delta \nu o ́ \mu o s$ ，
 other hand that there is a similar transition from vó $\mu \boldsymbol{\iota}$ to עó $\mu$ оs in 1292 a 32 sq．12．кai］каì $\pi \omega s \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus．，каì $\pi \omega \hat{s} \mathrm{M}^{s}$ ．Is not $\pi \hat{\kappa}$ ；a marginal query by some perplexed reader which has crept into the text？13．тєт $\boldsymbol{\eta}^{\prime} \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．，т $\uparrow \imath \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \circ \nu \Gamma \mathrm{M}^{8}$ Sus． In 1304 b 12 and $1305 \mathrm{~b} 27 \Pi^{1}$ wrongly substitute $\tau \rho ⿺ a \kappa o \sigma i \omega \nu$ and трьакобioıs for тєтракобiay and тєтракобiots，an error which occurs also in the MSS．of Lysias Or．30． 8 and elsewhere．On the other hand，in $125^{8} \mathrm{~b} \quad 27 \Pi^{1}$ have тéraptov in place of rрírov．In Hist． An．5．19． 553 a 1 all Bekker＇s MSS．have the form тєтрай $\mu \in \rho о \nu$. 14．av́rov̂ $\Gamma$ Sus．（Vet．Int．in suo periculo），av̀т̂̂ $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ，av̉тov̂ the rest and Bekker．25．aávtas $\Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{4}$ ：$\pi a ́ v v \mathrm{P}^{23}$ ．30．крívєı］крivєıv $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \Pi^{3}$ ．See critical notes on 1280 b 4 and 1283 a 7.
 as $\dot{\delta} \rho \mu \eta \theta \hat{\eta} v a \iota$（see Schn．）．38．$\epsilon i \delta \bar{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\eta}]$ Vet．Int．si autem，which may possibly stand for $\epsilon i \delta \epsilon \grave{i} \dot{\eta}: \mathrm{cp} .1292 \mathrm{~b} 32$ and 1295 a 34. тоиิто $\mu \grave{\eta} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．：$\mu \grave{\eta}$ тоѝто $\Pi^{1}$ Sus．See critical note on 1280 a 15 ．
 （Vet．Int．similiter）．10．оiкои̂ขтas］Vet．Int．habitabant，but Vet． Int．sometimes substitutes the indicative for the participle，e．g．in 1329 b 4，where he has lege statuit for $\nu \quad \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau o s$, in 1333 a 18 ， where he has potest for $\delta v \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o v$, and in 1305 a 24 ，where he has seditionem movit for $\sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \iota a ́ \sigma a s . ~ 14 . ~ \gamma \iota \gamma \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu о \iota] ~ \gamma є \nu o ́ \mu є \nu о \iota ~ M s ~ P ¹: ~$ we cannot tell from Vet．Int．facti whether $\Gamma$ had $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\prime} \mu \in \nu(\nu)$ or $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o l$ ．15．Vet．Int．does not translate $\pi_{0} \theta \epsilon \nu$ ，but neither does he translate $\pi ⿰ 丿 ㇄$ Pal．Bekk．${ }^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．transmutabantur）：$\mu \in \tau \in ́ \beta a \lambda o \nu$
 $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Julian（ep．ad Themist．p． 261 A ）and corr． $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ ，олоьь Vat．Pal．，
 om．Julian．29，av́tóv the third Basle edition of Aristotle，aùzóv $\Gamma \Pi$ ．$\dot{\eta}] \hat{\eta} \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{14}, \eta$ Vat．Pal．，$\hat{\eta}$ the rest．31．кai is added before karà in $\Pi^{2}$ ，but omitted in $\Pi^{1}$ Vat．Pal． （Vet．Int．suam voluntatem），av̉ชov̂ $\Pi$ ． 32．aṽrov̂ $\Gamma$ Bekk．Sus．
33．фu入ágєı P ${ }^{4}$ Ald．， $\phi v \lambda a ́ \xi \in \tau a \iota \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ，фu入ágaı $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc．Vat．Pal．：we cannot tell from Vet．Int．custodiet whether he found $\phi \nu \lambda a ́ \xi \in \iota$ or $\phi u \lambda a ́ \xi \epsilon \tau a \iota$ in $\Gamma$ ，for тoùs фvגatroнévovs in 1331 a 16 is rendered custodientes by Vet．Int．， while in 1285 a 26 фи入áттovбıv is rendered custodiunt．36．éка́бтоv］ Vet．Int．ea quae singulorum，where singulorum may possibly repre－
 20 and singulis ékáaтoıs in 1295 a 38 ．Did Vet．Int．find $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ added
 ovpakovaious all other MSS．except $\mathrm{P}^{\star}$ ，which has ovpakovaios．In Rhet．2．6．1384 b 16 Ac has $\sigma v \rho a к o \sigma i o v s ~(\sigma v \rho a k o v \sigma i o v s ~ Y b ~ Z b, ~ \sigma v \rho \rho a-~$ kovoious Q）．In Pol． 7 （5）．3．1303 a 38，however，all MSS．have
 except pr． $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ ，which has ovpakóбto．We know from inscriptions （Meisterhans，pp．21 ，75，ed．2）and from coins that Eupakóvto is the correct form．

1287 a 4．тo入ırєias Victorius and Camerarius（Interp．p．138）， followed by Bekker and Sus．：及aбıлєias Г П Vat．Pal．Julian（Ep． ad Themist．p． 261 A）appears to have read ßari入cias，for he says，


 from Vet．Int．principatur omnibus whether he found $\pi a \dot{\nu} \tau a$ or $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ in $\Gamma$ ：$\pi a ́ v t \omega \nu$ Julian，Sus．，$\pi a ̂ \nu$ Cod．Voss．of Julian（according to Hertlein）．10．є́avtov̂ $\Pi$ ：aủ兀ô̂ Julian，avirov̂ Hertlein．See ex－ planatory note．Vet．Int．adds dicendum after ó $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon u ́ s ~ f r o m ~ a ~ g l o s s ~$ $\lambda_{\epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon \in \rho}$ which appears in $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ ．$\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ om．Julian．тò add．Julian after oủס̀̀．

 Julian．15．rà Sus．following the better MSS．，tò Bekk．follow－ ing $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ and others of the less good MSS．16．roivov om．$\Pi^{1}$ but not Vat．Pal．oủס̀̀̀v $\Gamma$ ח Vat．Pal．Bekk．：ov̉ס́́va Bernays，Sus．

 om． $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ：Vet．Int．sed universale lex instituit，which probably

not once rendered by Vet. Int. instituere in the Politics (it is rendered insistere in 1336 b 25). Tò ka甘ódou may probably have been a gloss in $\Gamma$ (Sus. ${ }^{3}$ ); the words énitr $\bar{\delta} \epsilon s$ naı $\delta \in \dot{\jmath} \sigma a s$ were either wanting in $\Gamma$ or left untranslated by Vet. Int. 27. Vet. Int. adds omnia before his equivalent for $\dot{\epsilon} \pi a \nu o \rho \theta o v \sigma \theta a \iota$. He has dant for $\delta i \delta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ and may have found $\delta \iota \delta o a_{a \sigma \iota \nu}$ in his Greek text, but he is not always faithful to the number which he finds in his Greek text (e.g. in 1338 bir and $1296 \mathrm{a} 34,35$ ). ó $\boldsymbol{\tau} \tau$ å $\nu \delta o ́ \xi \eta \eta]$ Vet. Int. quodcunque videbitur, as in 1318 a 28 . The more usual equivalent is quodcunque videatur. 28. $\Pi$ Vat. Pal. have ó $\mu \dot{\mu} \nu$
 Vet. Int. qui quidem intellectum iubet principari videtur iubere principari deum et leges (thus he fails to render oủv and seems to have found $\nu o \hat{\nu} \nu$ in $\Gamma$ in the place of $\nu o ́ \mu о \nu)$. The Vossian MS. of Julian


 Vet. Int. quando enim concupiscentia tale et furor principatum habuerit (or habuit), tandem et optimos viros interimet, representing

 renders the present by the future, e.g. in 128 I a 19 ). $M^{8}$ has of $\tau \in$ in place of $\tilde{\eta} \tau \epsilon$, as $\Gamma$ apparently had $\begin{gathered} \\ \tau \\ \\ \text {. S. See next note. } 31 .\end{gathered}$

 has $\phi \theta \in i \rho \epsilon \iota)$ Sus. As to Vet. Int. see preceding note. In 1336 a ro the correct reading $\delta \iota a \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \epsilon \phi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ has been corrupted in $\Pi^{1}$ into $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon \theta a \iota$, and $\delta \iota a \sigma \tau \rho \epsilon \in \phi \epsilon \iota$ appears to have been corrupted in these MSS. here in a somewhat similar way. Julian has кai ó $\theta u \mu o ̀ s$
 agreeing with $\Pi^{2}$. 32. voûs ó yómos $\Pi^{2}$ : ó voûs עópos Ms Vat. Pal. Julian pr. P1: we cannot be sure from Vet. Int. intellectus lex est which reading he found in $\Gamma$. 34. кai om. Vat. Pal. possibly rightly : it is bracketed by Sus. But see explanatory note. 38. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon t a \nu]$ Vet. Int. affectum. He does not understand the word. In Rhet. 2.2.1378 b 14, 18 and 2.4.1382 a $2 \dot{\epsilon} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon a \sigma \mu o ́ s$ is rendered

 and perhaps $\Gamma$. Vet. Int. has persuasos ab inimicis for $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v \theta$ évtas


тıбтev $\theta$ éves is represented elsewhere in the Politics by creditit ( $\mathrm{r}_{3} \mathrm{O}_{5}$ a 22,28 ) or credibiles facti ( 1310 b 16 ), and nowhere by persuasi, while $\pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta \hat{\omega} \sigma t \nu$ is represented by persuadeantur in $\mathrm{I}_{332}$ b 7 .

## 1287 b 4. $\gamma$ à F П Vat. Pal.: © $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ Thurot, Sus. 6. $\omega \sigma \tau^{\prime} \epsilon i \Pi^{1}$



 venientibus). 17. $\gamma^{\epsilon}$ is added in $\mathrm{M}^{6} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Vat. Pal. and possibly was added in $\Gamma$, though Vet. Int. does not render it, for he seldom renders $\gamma \epsilon$. סvvatós] Vet. Int. potuit, but see above on 1286b 10.
 $\Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal. Bekk.: $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i M^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ : we cannot tell from Vet. Int. quon-

 esse), but this is not certain, for Vet. Int. often renders the active by the passive. 26. $\tau^{\prime}$ iб $\sigma \omega \Pi^{1}$ Vat. Pal. Sus.: $\delta$ " ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \omega s \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. 27. Svoiv] See explanatory note. 29. $\mu$ óvap $\neq \Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal. Bekk.: $\mu o \nu a ́ \rho \chi a \iota ~ \Pi \Pi^{1}$ Sus. $\quad$ 30. aútஸ̂̀ Morelius, Bekk., Sus., and
 Richards, probably rightly (cp. 33). 31. aúroû Sus. ${ }^{3}$, aùvồ $\Gamma$ П Bekk. ${ }^{3}$, aitoís Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ The Aldine edition of the Scholia Graeca in
 (ed. Didot, p. 390), gives avtroîs, but this quotation may have been interpolated by the editor of the Aldine, the Cretan Marcus Musurus, as to whose interpolations in these Scholia see Dindorf's preface in Didot's edition of them, p. iv. In that case this reading would no doubt be a conjectural emendation by Musurus. As to
 $\delta_{\epsilon \epsilon \sigma \pi o ̛ o ̀ ̀ ~} \Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal.: $\delta_{\epsilon \sigma \pi \pi \sigma \tau \iota<\grave{\nu} \nu} \Pi^{1}$ Sus. (two MSS. of the Vet. Int., however, a z , have despotum). Compare 1324 b 39 , where $\mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ have $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \tau<\kappa \omega \hat{\nu}$ and the other MSS. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \tau \omega \bar{\omega}$, the true reading being $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \sigma \tau \omega ิ \nu$. каĭ ä̀до ßaбi入єuтòv $\Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal. Bekk.: om. $\Pi^{1}$
 díxatov. 41. Tù is added before $\pi$ apà фv́otv in $\Pi^{1}$ Vat. Pal. (Vet. Int. quae practer naturam).

1288 a 6. $\eta \ddot{0} \eta$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but these MSS. occasionally omit $\eta^{\prime} \delta \eta$ : see critical note on 1268 b 21 . 9. z has aristocratica autem multitudo for ápıoтoкpatıкòv $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os (with rec. b), whereas all the other MSS. of Vet. Int. which have been examined have aristocratia.

rulers in an aristocracy cease to be a part of тò àpıбтократєкò̀ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os. Sus. prefers to bracket $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$ ä $\rho \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \delta v \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \epsilon \nu o \nu$, but this course is open to the same objection. In reality the dंрıбтократıкò $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os includes both rulers and ruled, as we see from c. 18 . 1288 a 35 sqq. 12. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu о \nu \kappa \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ ] Vet. Int. praesidibus, which stands for $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$ (see $1303 \mathrm{~b} 28,1305 \mathrm{a} 40$, 13 I 3 b 29 , and 13 I 6 b 18 ), but it is possible that Vet. Int. mistook the reading in $\Gamma$ and that this was $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \circ \nu \iota \kappa \omega \nu$,
 Sus. omit кaì $\hat{\epsilon} \nu$, Vat. Pal. reading $\epsilon \nu \gamma \iota \gamma \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ brackets кaì
 but a $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os which is a fit subject for Polity is not necessarily exclusively composed of $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu$ ккoi : it is rather under the sway of
 тоע тò $\pi \rho \circ \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \circ \hat{\nu} \nu$ ). Kaì $\epsilon \in \nu(\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ? $)$ is probably an intimation that the copyist found $\epsilon \in \gamma i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ in the text which he was copying in addition to $\epsilon ่ \gamma \gamma i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. $\pi \circ \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus., $\pi \rho \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu \Pi^{1}$ Vat. Pal. По入ıтькò̀ probably comes from the preceding line. ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ каì ä $\chi \chi \epsilon \downarrow \Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal. Bekk., ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ каі̀ ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus., каì ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ каі̆ ä $\chi \chi \in \sigma \theta a \iota \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$. See critical note on 1277 b 14. 15. єủnópoıs $\Pi^{1}$

 the two words may, however, have been placed where they stand in order to avoid the hiatus in $\hat{\eta}$ кail ${ }_{\epsilon}^{z} \nu a \tau \tau \nu a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \ddot{\partial} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, or they may be repeated (a common blunder) from $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu, 17$. 16. $\tau \omega \nu a ̀$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but see critical notes on 1273 b 27,1279 b 15,1283 b 2 , 1284 b II, and 1324 a 37 . 22. $\pi a ́ v \tau \eta ~ \Pi^{1}$, if Vet. Int. penitus stands for $\pi a ́ v \tau \eta, \pi a \nu \tau \eta \iota$ Vat. Pal., $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \eta$ Sus.: $\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. 24. ả̀ $\lambda a ̀$ кaì r Schn. Sus. (Vet. Int. immo, which represents ả $\lambda \lambda a ̀$ kai in 1282 a 20 -a fact which has hitherto escaped notice) : ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal. 27. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{4} \mathrm{Q}^{\mathrm{b}} \mathrm{T}^{\mathrm{b}}$ and possibly $\mathrm{\Gamma}$, followed by Bekker. 29. тоîtov om. $\Pi^{1}$, but see critical note on 1257 b 24 . 39. $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ $\tau \bar{\eta} s$ ápíт $\eta s \Pi^{2}$ Vat. Pal.: $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ ápíctŋs $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. optimae civitatis). So in $1260 \mathrm{~b} 23 \Pi^{2}$ have $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ mo入ıteias
 and in 1331 a $5 \Pi^{2}$ have tais oik $\eta \sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota$ rais ioiaus, while $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$ have $\tau a i ̂ s$ ioiaus oiк $\eta \sigma \in \sigma \iota$. It should be noticed that in

 of the MSS. of Vet. Int. collated by Sus.) : all the other MSS. have per candem.

1288 b 3. $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \Pi, \delta \grave{\eta}$ Vat. Pal. perhaps rightly: Conring had already
 $\pi \rho о \sigma \eta$ ŋ́коvбà $\sigma \kappa \epsilon ́ \psi \iota \nu$, which is evidently a slightly different version of the opening words of the Fourth (old Seventh) Book, is added by ГII Vat. Pal. at the end of the Third, except that $\mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{5}$ omit tò $\nu$ $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda o \nu \tau a$ and substitute $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ for $\delta \grave{\eta}$. In one of the best MSS. of the Metaphysics, $\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{b}}$, the closing words of one Book are often repeated in the opening words of the next : see Christ's preface to his edition of the Metaphysics, p. vii.

## BOOK IV (VII).

1288 b 5 . See critical note at the close of the Third Book.
入oyєīөaı II: Vet. Int. confessum esse, but he may probably have found $\dot{\delta} \mu \mathbf{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\gamma \epsilon} \bar{\sigma} \theta a t$, not $\dot{\omega} \mu 0 \lambda o \gamma \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$, in his Greek text (compare his renderings in 1262 b 6, where he has arbitratus est for oitctar, and
 zolantes, but this may probably stand for $\pi$ аратєтонє́vas, not $\pi \epsilon \tau о \mu \in ́ v a s$, for he has dicens for $\pi \rho \circ \epsilon \iota \pi \omega \nu$ in 1338 a 26 , pascentes for $\epsilon \not \epsilon \iota \nu \epsilon ́ \mu о \nu \tau a s$ in 1305 a 26, peccare for סtapaptávet in 1338 a 4I, 1288 b 37, and
 labores for $\phi$ i入omoviats in 1338 b 25 , to mention no other examples. 30. rov̂ is added after $\hat{\eta}$ in $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ : we cannot tell from Vet. Int. comedere vel bibere whether he found this $\tau$ ov̂ in $\Gamma$. 32. $\dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \mu \boldsymbol{i} \omega \boldsymbol{\omega}$
 quae circa prudentiam se habent, neque enim beatificant sic imprudentem, where Sus. thinks that the translator has rendered a gloss. 40. $\delta \iota a \lambda a \mu \beta a \dot{\prime} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \iota \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ : $\delta \iota a \beta a i v \epsilon \iota \nu \Pi^{1}$ (Vet. Int. provenire should probably be pervenire, the reading of Sus., which no doubt stands for $\delta \iota a \beta a i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$, though $\delta \iota a \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa \in \nu$ in 1272 b 21 is rendered transivit): $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ Lamb. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. See explanatory note on 1323 a 39.

1323 b 6. oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mathrm{\Gamma}$ (Vet. Int. quin immo) $\Pi^{2}$ : oủ $\mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu \mathrm{Ms}$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$. 8. $\hat{\omega}^{\nu}$ ] Vet. Int. eorum, which perhaps should be eorum quorum, or simply quorum. 9. av่̉ $\hat{\omega} \nu$ om. $\Pi^{1}$. Aủrov̂ is omitted by $\Pi^{1}$ in r 301 a 8. 15. є $\epsilon^{\prime \lambda} \lambda \eta \phi \epsilon \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ : $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda \eta \chi \overline{ } \Pi^{1}$ Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. 17. $\tau \iota \mu \dot{\omega} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu]$ Vet. Int. pretiosior: see critical note on 1267 b 1. 23. $\sigma v \nu \omega \mu \circ \lambda о \gamma \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu] z$ has confessum with all the MSS. of Vet. Int. except a, and this is probably the correct
reading : Sus. follows a, which has concessum. See critical note on ${ }^{1} 3^{2} 3$ a 20. 27. тoût' $\Gamma$ in place of $\tau a \hat{v} \tau^{\prime}$, the reading of $\Pi$ (Vet. Int. hoc). 41. є́ка́бть $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ Bekk. : éка́бтоv the rest, except that $\mathrm{P}^{4}$


1324 a 10. örot $\tau \epsilon$ ] All the MSS. of Vet. Int. except $z$ have quicunque: z quicunque autem. See critical notes on $1330 \mathrm{~b} 4,1332 \mathrm{a}$ 42 , and 1336 a 5 . 12. $\epsilon i ̈ \tau \epsilon \in \tau t s$ ] Vet. Int. si etiam aliquis, where $\tau \epsilon$ is rendered (it is not often rendered by Vet. Int.) and rendered by
 $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ has a contraction which may represent $\pi$ óтєрои (see Sus. ${ }^{1}$ ). 22. $\gamma$ à $\rho$ is omitted in $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ Bekk. See critical note on 1272 b

 סvo surely is 'and I call the political and the philosophical lives two.' There zas a question whether these lives were two or only one (cp. 28 sq. and Plato, Gorg. 500 D), but this can hardly be Aristotle's meaning here. Should $\tau$ oùs be added before $\delta$ v́o? 33. $\gamma \epsilon$ Spengel Sus., $\tau \in \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Vet. Int., as usual, does not render
 $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. 37. tivòs om. $\Pi^{1}$, but see critical note on 1288 a 16 .
 I add with Congreve ( $\mathrm{P}^{46}$ omit öpos also): $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ éviots $\delta^{\prime}$ ovitos кaì t $\hat{\nu} \nu$

 $\Pi^{1}$. 16. àтєктаүко́та and 18. àтєктаүко́tı] In $16 \mathrm{P}^{15}$ have à $\pi \epsilon-$ ктоуóta, pr. $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ (correxit margo recens) ànєкта⿱ко́ta, $\mathrm{P}^{46}$ àmєктакóta, $\mathrm{M}^{5}$ є́лтаккóta, and in $18 \mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{P}^{46}$ have àтєктакótı, pr. $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ (correxit recens) à $\pi \epsilon \kappa \tau a \nu \kappa o ́ t \iota, \mathrm{P}^{\delta}$ à àєктovóть: $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ has the forms given in the text (Sus. ${ }^{3}$ ). It is not absolutely certain that $\dot{\mu} \pi \epsilon к \tau а к о ́ \tau a$ and $\dot{a} \pi \epsilon-$ ктако́ть should not be read, for we find átєктако́тєs in Polyb. in. 18. 10 and ȧєєктакю́s in some MSS. in Polyb. 3. 86. ro, but the authority of $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ is in favour of àтєктаүко́тa and àтєктаүкótь, and àтєктá $\gamma \kappa a \sigma \iota$ occurs in Merıand. Mıซov́ $\mu \epsilon \nu \neq s$, Fragm. 8 (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 173) and $\dot{\pi} \pi \epsilon \kappa \tau a \gamma \kappa \omega$ in some MSS. (followed by Hultsch) in Polyb. 3. 86. ro (see Kühner, Ausf. gr. Gr., ed. Blass, 2. 468, and Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective, p. 395).
 20. катaпnךvíovat] Vet. Int. commassant, which probably represents


líraotat $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. suasisse aut sanasse) ; but see critical notes on 1282 a 17 and 1298 b 32 . 37. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ ó̧ov and oủ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o ́ \zeta o \nu ~ Г П$ Bekk. Giph. (p. 893) $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \circ \tau o ́ \nu$ and oủ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau o ́ v: ~$ Stahr, Sus. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \sigma \tau o ́ v$ and oủ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \sigma \tau o ́ v$, probably rightly. 39. $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \sigma \tau \omega \hat{\omega}$ Lamb. (also a recent correction in $\mathrm{P}^{5}$, but this corrector probably reproduces the conjecture of Lamb.: cp. 1332 a 41 ): Sepulveda had already translated the words iis duntaxat qui tali imperio sunt idonei, and Segni, à chie è atto à servire: $\delta \in \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \omega ้ \nu \mathrm{P}^{4} 6$ $\mathrm{Ls}, \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ от $\omega \nu$ the rest (Vet. Int. despotibus).
 סŋдоvót äpa Ms, and these MSS. may possibly be right; I would follow them if I was aware of any parallel to this use of $\delta \eta \lambda о \nu o ́ t \iota$.
 кıцá̧ovaı] z has reprobant, not reprobrant as Sus. (is this a misprint?).
 к $\boldsymbol{\eta} \nu \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$, for a c have despoticam, z despoticiam, and b despociam: despotica, however, represents $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \pi \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{i}$ ia in 1253 b 19. 29. aủzò tò corr. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ (i. e. the scribe of $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ in the same ink as the MS.),
 $e$ conj. $\delta \varepsilon i \nu$ in place of $\delta \in i$, but cp. 2. 12. 1274 a 5 , where the indirecta oratio is similarly abandoned, though Aristotle is describing the views of others. 39. $i \pi \sigma \boldsymbol{\lambda} o \gamma i \zeta \epsilon \iota$, the third Basle edition of Aristotle, followed by Sus. $\mathrm{S}^{\text {b }}$, a MS. of very little authority, which Bekker follows, has imonoyєiv: all the other MSS. imo入oytєiv. The existence of the word $\dot{v} \pi o \lambda o \gamma \epsilon i v$ is doubtful, for in Theopomp. Com., Inc. Fab. Fragm. 3 I (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 822 : 5. cxx) the true reading is not $\dot{v} \pi o \lambda o \gamma \epsilon i \nu$ but $\dot{v} \pi o \lambda \epsilon \hat{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$. The active $\dot{v} \pi \sigma 力 0-$ yi $\zeta_{\epsilon \iota \nu}$ is, however, extremely rare (see Liddell and Scott, s.v.). Richards doubts $\dot{v} \pi 0 \lambda o \gamma i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$, especially with a genitive, and suggests


1325 b 3 . $\psi \in \hat{v} \delta o s$ is not rendered by Vet. Int.
7. $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu$ is added before $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota$ by Thurot and Sus. 20. aútî̀ Vict. Bekk. Sus. : aùtề Г П. 22. кaì before $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ om. $\Pi^{1}$ and Julian, Ep. ad Themist. p. 263 D , but $\Pi^{1}$ often omit kai, and other errors occur in Julian's quotation. 37. $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a t$ ] Vet. Int. fore, but this probably stands for $\gamma \in \nu \in ́ \sigma \theta$ at, as esse stands for $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a t$ in 1288 a 16. $\sigma \nu \mu \mu \in ́ \tau \rho o v$ ] Vet. Int. moderata: elsewhere $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \mu \in \tau \rho \circ$ s is rendered by commensuratus ( 1327 b 6, 1298 b 25 ). $\Sigma v \mu \mu \epsilon \tau \rho i n$ is always rendered by commensuratio. Moderatus represents $\mu$ érpıos in $\mathrm{I}_{2} 67 \mathrm{~b} \mathrm{I}_{3}$, moderatius

moderata may stand for $\mu \epsilon \tau \rho i a s$ here, though $\mu$ étpoos is more usually rendered by mediocris. 38. $\pi \rho о \ddot{\pi} \pi \boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \theta \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a i]$ Vet. Int. praesupponi, just as he renders $\delta \iota \eta \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ by dividi in 1330 a 24 , $\delta \iota \omega \rho i \sigma \theta a \iota$ by distingui in 1330 b 55 , and катєбкєváन $\begin{aligned} & \text { al } \\ & \text { by constitui in } 133 \mathrm{r} \\ & \mathrm{b} \\ & 10\end{aligned}$

1326 a 2. aũ̃ך $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. : aủ $\grave{\eta} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. 6. nóvous $\tau \epsilon$ ] Vet. Int. quos quot, but perhaps two alternative readings have here together found their way into the text. 7. öб $\sigma \boldsymbol{\nu} \Pi$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ (Vet. Int. quantam may stand for either ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \eta \nu$ or $\left.\pi o ́ \sigma \eta \nu\right): \pi o ́ \sigma \eta \nu$ Sylburg, Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, Sus. : see explanatory note on 1326 a 5. 10. roia is added before $\mu \varkappa \kappa$ à in $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ Bekk. Sus. : om. $\mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$. 14. oỉrє́o力 om. $\Pi^{1}$. 18.
 21. $\mu o \rho i \omega \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : $\mu \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus. : we cannot tell from Vet. Int. partibus which reading he found in $\Gamma$. Mєp $\omega \nu$ in $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ may be repeated from $\mu \epsilon \rho o s$ in the preceding line: this kind of error occurs not infrequently in $\Pi^{1}$. 25. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\mu} ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : oủ $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu$ $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \Pi^{1}$ Sus. (Vet. Int. non solum sed). 29. $\tau \epsilon$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ : the reading in $\Gamma$ is uncertain, for Vet. Int. seldom translates $\tau \epsilon$. 34.
 $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s \Pi^{1}$ Sus. : $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.

1326 b 4 . ่่̇ $\nu$ toîs $\mu \grave{\iota} \nu \mathrm{P}^{234}$ etc. Bekk.: ẻv $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ тoîs $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Ald. Sus. 12. póáoıov] All MSS. of Vet. Int. but z have facile est, but

 however, whether Vet. Int. found in his Greek text a different reading from that which we have in the MSS., for in 1302 b 28 he has eos qui sine ordine et sine principatu for $\tau \overline{\mathrm{s}}$ àta̧̧as кà̀ àvapरias, and in 1310b 21 he has conditores populi et prospectores for tàs $\delta \eta \mu$ rovprias кaì ràs $\theta \epsilon \omega$ pias. He seems now and then to allow himself a little laxity in his rendering of substantives in -ia. $\mathbf{3 2}$. tò öpol om. $\mathrm{P}^{34} \mathrm{pr}$. $\mathrm{P}^{2}$, but erroneous omissions occur occasionally in the MSS. of the second family (e.g. of $\mu \dot{\eta}$ in 1335 b 25 and of Epyov in 1288 b 16), though not so often as in those of the first family, and here tò̀ öpò can hardly be spared, for it would be difficult to supply it from 23. 34. ov $\mu \beta a i \nu \eta]$ z has accidit probably rightly: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. have accidet. 36. aủrin $]_{\text {R }}$ Richards suggests whether av̉r $\eta$ s should not be read, but perhaps aúrí $\nu$ is defensible : see explanatory note on 1326 b 35 .

1327 a 5. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu]^{\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu}$ oủv Schn. Sus. See, however, explanatory
 $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ and pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ (see Sus. ${ }^{1}$ ), followed by Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus., $\pi$ od入ì $\mathrm{I}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$
 Sylburg, Bekk., Sus. : полє $\mu$ ious Г П. 23. Susemihl (Jahresbericht für Altertumswissenschaft, lexix. (1894), p. 273) thinks that
 (Athens, 1893 ) is right in bracketing $\pi \rho o{ }^{2}$, but see explanatory note.
 iпáp 34. тò aùrò $\nu \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ äotv $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus. ${ }^{4}$, except that $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ has aù̇̀̀v: : vє́ $\mu \in \varepsilon \nu$ av̉tò тò äбтv $\Gamma$ Sus. ${ }^{12}$ (Vet. Int. ut neque occupetur ipsum municipium).

1327 b 11. ז $\bar{s}$ vavieiias] Vet. Int. navigium, though elsewhere he rightly translates the word navigatio. 13. каi before тoviro om. $\Pi^{1}$ Sus., but the authority of these MSS. is weak in omissions, and especially in omissions of кaí. 14. 'H $\rho a \kappa \lambda \epsilon \omega \tau \omega \bar{\jmath}$ ] See explanatory note.
 civitate magnitudine aliis contractiore (z artiore), which appears to


 the reading of pr. ${ }^{4}$ see Sus. ${ }^{1}$ and Sus. ${ }^{4}$ : but these MSS. have

 probably repeated from the preceding line. 31. $\beta$ हो $\bar{\tau} \iota \sigma \tau a \mathrm{II}$ : Vet.
 omit it, probably rightly. Sus. brackets it. 35. $\tau \grave{\epsilon} \Pi^{2}: \tau \epsilon$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ : om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ : Sus. brackets it : the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain, for Vet. Int. seldom translates $\tau \epsilon$. But the authority of $\Pi^{1}$ in omissions of $\tau \epsilon$ is weak, for these MSS. often omit it. T $\epsilon$ may be merely a blundered dittography of the first syllable of the next word кékpatal. It can hardly be accounted for here in the way in which Stallbaum accounts for its presence in Plato, Meno 72 E, Phaedo 63 C, and Hipp. Maj. 282 B.
1328 a 2. aiperau z tollitur: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. attollitur.
 ì $\pi$ áy $\chi \in 0$ ] So Bergk, probably rightly, though $\Gamma \Pi$ have où in place of $\sigma \grave{\imath}$ and all MSS. but $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{5}$ have $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{̀}$ in place of $\pi u \rho a ̀: ~ a ̀ \pi a ́ \gamma \chi \epsilon o ~ \mathrm{P}^{236}$
 perforationes Vet. Int., whatever that may represent (z has alancenis perforati omnes with a dot under the second $n$ of alancenis to expunge it). Vet. Int. has enim here for $\gamma$ àp $\delta \grave{\eta}$, as in 1284 b 29.
13. $\delta \in i ̂ \nu ~ \Pi^{2}, \delta \epsilon i ́ M^{\S}, \delta \epsilon ́ \operatorname{pr} . P^{1}$ : Vet. Int. does not render it.
 (Vet. Int. putant, which is his equivalent for $\nu o \mu i \zeta \omega \sigma \iota$ in 1302 a 25 ): ขopi\}ovar has evidently slipped in here from the line below and
 De Fraterno Amore, c. $5 \cdot 480$ D, Sus. ( $\pi$ о $\lambda_{\epsilon} \mu \iota o \iota$ in place of $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \iota$ Г) :
 unmetrical version, and in $1253 \mathrm{~b} 3^{6} \Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{B}}$. 16. $\pi \epsilon ́ \rho a \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: $\pi \epsilon$ foan $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus. : the reading of. $\Gamma$ is uncertain. oí $\delta \in$ Gomperz,
 $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$, perhaps rightly (see critical note on 1326 a 7 ):
 26. $\delta \in i ̂ \Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{4}$, $\delta \dot{\eta}$ the rest. тaùtò $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus., тoûto $\Pi^{1}$. 28. $\delta^{\prime} \bar{\eta}$ $\Pi^{1}, \delta^{\circ} \eta$ Bekk. Sus., $\delta \dot{\eta} \Pi^{2}$. 40. rov̂ $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk., and probably $\Gamma$; $\tau \hat{\omega} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, $\tau \hat{\omega}$ Sus. : Vet. Int. palam quod hoc causa quare fiant civitatis species, which probably represents $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ ís tov̂r' aïtion tov (not
 riveo $\theta a t$ is rendered causa autem quare tunc quidem fiebat).


 סıà tò ảvaزкаîo imápXєı probably $\Gamma$, for Vet. Int. has in his utique erunt, propterea quod necessarium existere. Cp. 1333 b 20, where propterea quod exercitati fuerunt represents $\delta \iota a ̀$ tò $\gamma \epsilon \gamma v \mu \nu a ́ \sigma \theta a t$, $1282 \mathrm{~b} 5, \mathrm{I} 338 \mathrm{a} 39, \mathrm{I} 339 \mathrm{~b} 34,4 \mathrm{r}, 1295 \mathrm{a}$ 15, and many other passages. Vet. Int. renders $\delta \iota o$ by propter quod, not propterea quod. I supply $\hat{a}$ before àvaरkaîov, which might easily drop out: $\delta u a ̀$ $\tau \grave{~}$ is of course impossible and $\delta$ tò seems to me unsatisfactory. 11. Schn. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. add $\tau \grave{a} s$ before $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa$ ás, but see explanatory note. 21. тарабкєváбovaı $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ Bekk. and perhaps $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. qui praeparent): тарабкєvá̧ovб九 $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{8}$ Sus. 22. à аукаi $\omega \nu$ ] See explanatory note on 1328 b 22. 29. тaủtò Sus. : тойто $\Gamma$ П Bekk. 32. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but these MSS. often omit $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$. 41. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ aj $\rho \in \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus. : ai $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain.

 ón see Eucken, De Partic. Usu, p. 45.

1329 a 1. $\mathrm{P}^{4} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{b}}$ Ald. add $\pi$ oגiras after $\tilde{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a$, , but these MSS. have little authority. For similar additions in them intended to complete the sense see critical notes on $1255 \mathrm{~b} 12,1303 \mathrm{~b} 35$,

1304 a 15 ，and $133^{2}$ a 30 ．6．$\delta \dot{\epsilon} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．Sus．：$\delta \grave{\eta} \Pi^{1}$ ． 11 ． тoîs aùroîs Bekk．Sus．：tov̀s aùroús Г п．Camerarius，commenting
 $\delta \epsilon i$. Eosdem esse oportet utrosque，id est quibus ambo munera mandentur．Kara入入 $\eta \lambda$ órepov esset，si scriberetur roîs aủroîs，nimirum àmodoréov，quod supra autor communiter posuerat．＇If roùs aủrov́s were retained，I should prefer to supply，not $\epsilon_{i v a i}^{i} \delta \hat{i}$（with Camer－
 （cp．5）．13．тウ̀̀ $\left.\pi{ }^{2} \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{a} \nu \nu \tau a i ́ \tau \eta \nu\right]$ See explanatory note． 16. éroiv］Lamb．Bekk．${ }^{1}$ would exchange the places of this évriv and civat，17．17．eiva is transferred by Camerarius to after toúrovs， 18，and by Sus．to after $\delta \epsilon \hat{i}$ ， 18 ．Vet．Int．adds videtur after his rendering for cival，but it is not likely that he found $\delta_{0 \kappa \in i}$ in his Greek text；he sometimes seeks to mend defects in it by conjec－ tures（see vol．ii．p．lxiv）：cp．also his addition of vivere in 1265 a
 Vet．Int．oportet esse（ $\delta \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}$ eivaı $\Gamma$ ？）：$\delta \epsilon \hat{i}$ without civaı $\Pi$ ．Bekker adds tivat．See explanatory note on 1329 a 1 7．20．$\gamma$ févos $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．， $\mu$ épos $\Pi^{1}$ Sus．Mépos may possibly come from ${ }^{23}$ ，$\mu \hat{\epsilon} \rho o s \tau$ ． 26 ．$\hat{\eta}$ before $\pi$ пfotoikovs is found in $\mathrm{r} \Pi$ ，but Sus．is probably right in bracketing it：cp．c．10．1 330 a 28 sq．27．i $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \omega \nu$ Г Ls Ald．， iє $\epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$ the rest：i iepé $\omega \nu$ Bekk．Sus．33．aùrò̀s］Sus．aùroùs？There is something to be said for this suggestion（cp．Eth．Nic．8．ri．
 $\left.\mu \in \theta^{0} \dot{\eta} \dot{\delta} 0 \nu \eta \hat{s}\right)$ ，but on the whole I incline to retain aủroùs．34．тoúrous
 other MSS．，so far as they have been examined．Taîs if $\rho \omega \sigma$ oúvaus $\Gamma \Pi$ Bekk．Bekker may be right in reading toúrous and taîs ie $\rho \omega$－



 But as almost all MSS．have toúrous，not qoúrous，it seems better to substitute ràs ief

 Int．lege statuit，but see critical note on 1286 b io．10．$\mu$ era－ ßadóvras］Vet．Int．transsumentes，which represents $\mu$ ета入aßövтas（ cp. 1326 b 21，1328a ${ }^{2} 7$ ，and 1339a 35）．13．yà $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．：©è $\Pi^{1}$ Sus．18．тò $\left.\mu \dot{\iota} \nu \pi \rho \rho \grave{s} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mathrm{Tv} \rho \rho \eta{ }^{2} \dot{a} \nu\right]$ Vet．Int．quod quidem apud

Tyrreniam, which may possibly represent $\tau \grave{o} \mu \dot{\mu} \nu \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \hat{\eta}$ Tuppquiáa, for apud represents $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime}$ with the dative in 133 r b 10 and 1322 a 26. As to Tvppquiav see critical note on 1280 a 36 . 21. X $\omega$. ${ }^{2}{ }^{2} \Pi^{1}$, Xá $\omega \nu \epsilon \mathrm{P}^{234}$ etc. The name of the race is X $\hat{\omega} \boldsymbol{\mu} \epsilon$ and the name of their country X $\dot{\omega} \nu \eta$ in Strabo, p. 255 : cp. X $\dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$, Strabo, p. 264 , and X $\omega$ viav, Strabo, p. 654, and Lycophron, Alex. 983. Eipitıv
 Vet. Int. 'It seems certain that we should read $\Sigma \iota \rho i \not \tau \iota \nu$ for súpтıv : Lycophr. Alex. 983' (the late Sir E. H. Bunbury in Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, Art. Chones). 30. kaì $\tau a ̀ \pi \epsilon \grave{~} \pi$ às $\pi o \lambda_{t}-$ reias] z has et qua (should be quae) circa politias: all Susemihl's MSS. of the Vet. Int. have et circa politias. 34. єip $\quad$ н́évots] See explanatory note on 1329 b 33 .

1330 a 1. $\left.\tau \hat{\eta} \chi \rho \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota\right]$ z has $u s u$, perhaps rightly: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. have usui. 2. $\gamma เ \nu о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu]$ See explanatory note on 1330 a 1. 10. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu i \delta \iota \omega \tau \omega \nu$ ] Vet. Int. propriam (ioiav $\Gamma$ ?). 14. ràs є́ซðatıás] Vet. Int. proprias necessitates. 20. סıò $\pi a \rho^{\prime} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a v ̇ т o v ̀ s ~ \pi o \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu \omega \nu]$ Vet. Int. corum quae ad ipsos proeliorum ; $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu o s$ is rendered by proelium in 1297 b 19 also. 28. $\delta \in \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu ~ \delta \epsilon]$ z has secundo autem: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. et secundo autem. 30. тoútal ס̀̀ tov̀s $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ èv roîs ioious civat iotoovs $\mathrm{P}^{4} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ probably rightly. Almost all other MSS. as well as $\Gamma$ add $i \delta i o u s$ before $\epsilon ่ \nu \tau o i s ~ i \delta i o u s: ~ \Gamma$

 oin om. $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. 38. ait $\tau \in \mathrm{P}^{\ddagger}$ Ald. etc., ä $\tau \in \mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc., ai $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. quae), but Vet. Int. rarely renders $\tau \epsilon$. Coray and Sus. add ai before катà $\beta$ opéav, but see explanatory notes on I 330 a 40 and 1330 b ro. єỉxєi $\boldsymbol{\mu \epsilon \rho o i ] ~ V e t . ~ I n t . ~ r e c e n t i o r e s . ~}$

1330 b 2. $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ after aùroís om. $\Pi^{1}$. 4. $\left.\tau \epsilon\right]$ Vet. Int. autem ( $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \Gamma$ ? ). The same thing occurs in $133^{6}$ a 5 and $133^{2}$ a 42 (see also critical note on $13^{2} 4 \mathrm{a}$ 10). 6. ${ }^{\circ} \mu \beta$ piots $\mathrm{P}^{5} \mathrm{~S}^{b}$ and perhaps $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ (Vet. Int. per praeparationem susceptaculorum aquarum imbrium), ỏ $\mu \beta$ piovs $\mathrm{M}^{s}$
 did he misread $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu \circ \nu$ as $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$, or did he find $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$ in $\Gamma$ ?
 $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. 16. $\mu \eta^{\prime} \tau^{\prime} \Pi$ Bekk. Sus., $\mu \eta \delta^{\circ}$ Coray. See critical notes on 1257 b 12 and 1293 a 9. тоьovit $\nu \Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. : тои́т $\omega \nu$ the rest, followed by Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ 18. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ om. $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ : the reading of $\Gamma$ is of course uncertain. 21. $i \delta i \omega \nu$ ] oiкєi $\omega \nu \Pi^{1}$ (Vet. Int. familiarium,
which no doubt represents oikei $\omega \nu$ ，as in 1336 a 8 and 1312 b 13 ）： oikєi $\omega \nu$ ，however，is probably a corruption of oik $\iota \omega$ ，an alternative reading for oikij $\sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ ，which has displaced $i \delta i \omega \omega$ ．22．$\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ om．$\Pi^{1}$ ， as often elsewhere．23．кai om．$\Pi^{1}$ Sus．，but the authority of $\Pi^{1}$ is very weak in omissions and especially in omissions of кai． 24. $i \pi \pi o \delta a ́ \mu \epsilon t o \nu M^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Bekk．Sus．：inтoঠá $\mu$ ò $\Pi^{2}$ ：we cannot tell from Vet．Int．domativum equorum which reading he found in $\Gamma$ ．$\Pi^{2}$ have

 $\Pi^{1}$ Sus．（cp． 5 （8）．5．I339 b 19）．28．$\gamma \in \omega \rho$ боis］See explanatory note．31．кaì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \epsilon t a \nu ~ k a i ̀ ~ к o ́ \sigma \mu o \nu ~ \Pi^{2}: \Pi^{1}$ add $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ before кó $\sigma \mu \circ \nu$ ，but wrongly in all probability：cp．Metaph．A．2． 982 b 23 ， кaì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \rho ̣ a \sigma \tau \omega ́ \nu \eta \nu ~ к a i ̀ ~ \delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ ，and Pol． 5 （8）．5．1339b 22，кai єis

 See Kühner，Ausführl．gr．Gramm．，ed．2，§451．I．32．тàs $\tau \eta ̂ s$ à $\rho \epsilon \tau \eta ̄ s$ àv $\nu \iota \pi o \iota o v \mu \epsilon ́ v a s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota s] ~ z ~ h a s ~ v i r l u t i ~ c o n t r a f a c t a s ~ c i v i t a t e s: ~$ perhaps contrafactos（Sus．）is a misprint．
 37 he translates $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ тольopкias correctly by obsidione．Insultus， if right，will therefore hardly represent mo入ıoркias，but what it represents is doubtful．5．ó $\rho \epsilon \iota \nu o u ̀ s \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ：ob $\boldsymbol{\text { onoùs }} \Pi^{2}$ ：the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain．taîs oikそ́⿱㇒日ध $\iota$ taîs ioiàs $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．：taîs iơiaıs oikń $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota \mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．propriios habitationibus）．See
 тoís $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \grave{\eta}$ кєкт $\eta \mu \in ́ v o \iota s$ Aretinus＇translation，followed by Bekk．${ }^{2}$ and Sus． But it is more natural to speak of cities as кєктทuévą тєíX $\eta$ than of peoples：cp．．9，éXov́vats，and $133 \circ$ b 32 sq．21．$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu \ldots \phi$ ．．фиак－ т $\eta$ pious om．$\Pi^{1}$ ．aủtà $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．（it forms part of the passage which $\Pi^{1}$ omit）：aủzò Bonitz，Sus．24．өeious $\Gamma \Pi$（except $P^{4}$ ，which has $\theta$ eoîs），Bekk．${ }^{1}$ ：$\theta$ єoîs Bekk．${ }^{2}$ Sus．，who says however in Qu．Crit． p． 409 n. ＇at forsitan $\theta$ eioss servare liceat．＇25．à $\rho \chi \epsilon i \omega \nu$ ］à $\rho \chi \omega \bar{\omega}$ $\mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{s}}$ Ald．，áp $\rho a i \omega \nu$ the rest，except $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ ，which has ápxєíwv． $\mathbf{3 0}$. є́ $\rho \nu \mu \nu 0 \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega$ ］Vet．Int．eminenter，but Vet．Int．often renders the comparative by the positive（e．g．in 1283 a 35,1287 b 9， 1333 b 10 ，
 Bekk．${ }^{2}$ Sus．and apparently Bonitz（Ind． 487 b 5r）．See however explanatory note on i33r a $3^{\text {I．}}$ 34．тоьôtò M $^{s} \Pi^{2}$ etc．Bekk．： $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ тotoúr $\omega \nu \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ ，for az have talium，though the seven other MSS．of Vet．Int．which have been examined have
talem．Sus．reads $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \tau o \iota o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ，against the weight of MS．authority， it would seem．See critical notes on 1336 b 8 and 1314 b 26. 39．тoùs $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta v \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o u s ~ \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ ，тà $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta u ́ \tau \epsilon \rho a \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ，$\pi$ tàs $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma$－ ßutépas $\Gamma$ ？（Vet．Int．matronas autem）．

1331 b 4．$\downarrow \pi \lambda \eta \theta_{o s} \dagger$ ］Should $\pi \rho o \epsilon \sigma$ tòs be read？Cp．Plato，Rep．

 others，add кai before the second eis，perhaps rightly（cp．c．14． 1333 a 30 ）．Welldon reads kai in place of the second eis．But， if $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os is retained，some further change would appear to be necessary－the substitution（with Sus．）of $\dot{\delta} \pi \lambda i$ itas or $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \iota \omega \in \mathrm{tas}$ for the second eis，or the addition of каi $\dot{\boldsymbol{\pi} \lambda i \boldsymbol{i} a s}$（with Welldon）after каї äpхоитаs．Perhaps，however，$\pi \lambda \bar{\eta}$ 有 should be $\pi \rho o \epsilon u \tau o ̀ s$, and the classes referred to by Aristotle are those at the head of the State， which do not include the hoplites．5．каì $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ iєpé $\omega \nu$ бvoб⿱iтьa］ Should $\tau \grave{a}$ be added before $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ？See，however，explanatory note on 1285 b 12，тồ $\sigma \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \pi \tau \rho o v$ є́ $\pi a \nu a ́ \tau a \sigma \iota s . ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mathrm{om} . \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$ ，but the authority of these MSS．is weak in omissions，and especially in omissions of the article．8．$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad$ after $a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu \nu$ om． $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ：the reading of $\Gamma$ is of course uncertain．13．$\nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \mu \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\Pi^{1}$ corr． $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ Bekk．${ }^{1}$ Sus．，$\nu \in \nu \epsilon \mu \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ over an erasure $\mathrm{P}^{4}, \mu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ pr． $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ etc．Bekk．${ }^{2}$ 16．à ${ }^{2}$ күкаiov］ z has necessarium：is neces－ sariam in Sus．a misprint？24．${ }^{\prime} \times$ before $\pi o i \omega \nu$ om．$\Pi^{1}$ Bekk．${ }^{2}$ Sus． So in 1275 b I $7 \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ have $\hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho i \pi_{\alpha} \alpha \nu \tau \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \tau \iota \nu \omega \nu$, where the rest have $\hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \pi a \dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu \hat{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \iota \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，and in $1275 \mathrm{~b} 32 \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and perhaps $\mathrm{\Gamma}$


 каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi o \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa a ̀ s ~ \pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon \iota, ~ M s ~ \mathrm{P}^{1}$ omit the second $\pi \rho o \dot{s}$ ，and in
 omit the second $\pi \rho$ òs．See also the readings in 1322 b 32 ，where $\Pi^{1}$ omit $\pi \epsilon \rho$ i．See critical note on 1282 a 17 ．The first family of MSS．have little authority in omissions，and especially in the omission of small words．26．$\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ Coray Bekk．${ }^{2}$ Sus．probably rightly ：$\pi$ тлı七єv́є $\theta$ aı $\Pi$ ．Vet．Int．has civitatem quae debet esse beata et politizare bene，which leaves it uncertain what reading he found in $\Gamma$ ． The letter $\sigma$ is easily added or omitted between two vowels in verbs （see critical notes on $1255 \mathrm{~b} 24,1274$ a 5， 1298 b 20），as well as at the end of words．See Mr．T．W．Allen in Journ．Hellenic Studies，

$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \dot{\beta} \xi \epsilon \omega \nu$ oj $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s] z$ has in eo quod est intentionem et finem actionum poni recte, which is probably correct: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. omit est. 31. є̈ккєıгаı] z has iacet rightly: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. latet. калиิs $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \Pi^{2}$ : кало̀s $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ (Vet. Int. bona). Sus. ${ }^{3}$ ascribes the reading кù̀̀s to $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{8}$, but this is probably a misprint for $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ (see Sus. ${ }^{124}$ ). 32. оं $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \Pi$, except $\mathrm{P}^{4}$, which has ö $\tau \epsilon$, and $\mathrm{P}^{2}$, which has éviore and is followed by Bekker. 34. rà $\rho$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but probably wrongly: see critical note on 1272 b 36 , and compare the omission of $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ by $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{s}}$ in 1324 a 22 . 41.
 $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus., an order which suits $\delta \in i \tau a \ell ~ \gamma \grave{\rho} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. well, though on the other hand in Plato, Laws 747 C (which is probably present
 єїтє каì фúvıs ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \eta$ тıs тotaúr $\eta$. For a similar interchange in the order of two words see critical notes on 1333 b 36 and 1318 b 4 .

1332 a 4. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$, but omissions of the

 on 1332 a 7. 13. кaì is added before ảvaүкаîaı in $\Gamma$ Ms. 17. aï $\rho \epsilon \sigma i s$ ] See explanatory note on 1332 a 16. 22. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ before ajpeтìv om. $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ : contrast the reading of these MSS. in 1328 b 4 I . Their authority in omissions of the article is small. 23. тà before áya $\theta \dot{a}$ is bracketed by Reiz and Sus., and omitted by Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. places a full stop after $\dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s \dot{a} \gamma a \theta \dot{a}$ and reads $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$ in place of $\delta \tilde{\eta} \lambda o \nu \delta^{\prime}$, but not, I think, rightly. $\Delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \ldots \dot{a} \pi \lambda \omega \bar{s}$ is part of the paragraph introduced by kaì $\gamma \dot{a} \rho, 2 \mathrm{I}$.
 added after $\gamma$ à $\rho$ in $\mathrm{P}^{4} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ Bekk., but see critical note on $\mathrm{I}_{3} 29$ a . 32. $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ add $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ before $\tau \dot{v} \chi \eta s$ : we cannot tell whether Vet. Int. found $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ in $\Gamma$. See critical note on 1270 b 19 . In 30 we have $\dot{\eta}$ rúX $\eta$ (as in c. 1. 1323 b 28 and Eth. Nic. 6. 4. II40 a 18), but in

 therefore that $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ are right. The best MSS. omit $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ before rúx ns in $^{12} 5^{8} \mathrm{~b} 36$. Cp. also $\mathrm{I}^{2} 3^{3} \mathrm{~b} \quad 27-29$. 33. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ are probably right in adding $\gamma \epsilon$ after $\sigma \pi$ ovoaia: we cannot tell from Vet. Int. at vero whether he found $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ or $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \ldots \gamma \epsilon$ in his Greek text, for he renders both the one and the other by at vero (see e.g. 1286 a 16 and 1287 a 4 r ). $\tau \hat{\varphi} \boldsymbol{~} \boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ Ald. corr. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ (i. e. a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ in the same ink as the MS.): Vet. Int.
at vero studiosa civitas est in cives participantes politia studiosos esse: the rest тò. 41. oũt $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Ar. pr. $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ : єita Lamb., followed by Bekk. and Sus. (also a recent correction in $\mathrm{P}^{5}$, as to which see critical note on 1324 b 39). 42. $\tau \in \Pi$ Bekk.: Vet. Int. autem ; hence Sus. reads $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ in place of $\tau \epsilon$, but see critical notes on 1324 a 10, 1330 b 4, and I336 a 5 .

1332 b 1. $\mu \epsilon \tau a \beta a \lambda \epsilon i \nu \quad \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: $\mu \epsilon \tau \alpha \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus. and possibly $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. transmutari). See for similar variations critical
 pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$, for Vet. Int. has quod quidem utique natura,


 I II Bekk.: סıaipєєь» Leonardus Aretinus, who translates natura enim ostendit quemadmodum haec distinguenda sint. Diaiperev (which Bonitz approves, Ind. $18 \mathrm{~b} 5^{2}$ ) is probably right: $\mathrm{cp} .16, \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 $\mathfrak{a} \xi \xi_{i a \nu}$ (referring to the same matter), and c. I7. 1337 a I, $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\eta}$

 and (between brackets) Sus. 37. тav̉тò $\Pi^{2}$ Sus.: тaủtê Ms pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$, om. F : тaủ̀ò̀ Bekk. Vet. Int. natura enim dedit electionem faciens eidem generi hoc quidem iunius, hoc autem senius. tò $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu .$. тò $\delta \grave{\epsilon}]$ тотє̀ $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$. . . тотє̀ $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$. 40. тоиิтоע тò̀ $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : тò $\nu$ тоьôtov $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. (Vet. Int. talem). See critical note on 1292 a 17 .

1333 a 18. סvvá $\mu \in \nu \nu \nu]$ Vet. Int. potest, but see above on 1286 b 10. 32. каі̀ $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \pi \rho a \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ к.т.入.] See explanatory note. 40.
 aipé $\sigma \epsilon \iota s$ Coray. In 1318a 16 Schn. Bekk。 ${ }^{2}$ and Sus. seem right in reading aipé $\sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ in place of $\delta \iota a \iota \rho \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ (unless with Lamb. we should read áp $\quad$ au $\rho \epsilon \sigma \iota \omega ิ \nu$ ), and Sus. follows Coray in reading aipéo $\epsilon$ s here. The change is not without plausibility, especially if we compare Isocr. De Pace § 106, tàs aipévets têv $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, but both Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ and Bonitz (Ind. $180 \mathrm{~b} 3^{8}$ ) retain סtatpécets, and I incline on the whole to follow them, particularly looking to
 ס̀̀ єis rò кадá, 41. Vet. Int. fails to render $\mu \in \grave{\nu}$, but he fails to render $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ in $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ in 1300 b 34 also.

1333 b 2 . $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ before $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \tau \nu$ om. $\Pi^{1}$ Sus., but the authority of these MSS. in the omission of small words is weak. 7. $\beta$ é $\lambda$ tьo
 z has facile et redarguibilia: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. facile arguibilia. The addition of et in z is wrong, but redarguibilia may well be right, for $\dot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \xi \in \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \epsilon \gamma_{\kappa \tau a \iota}$ immediately after is rendered sunt
 though in 1308 a I $\dot{\epsilon} \xi \in \lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \chi \epsilon \tau a \iota$ is rendered arguuntur. 16. $\nu \hat{v} v$
 by Sus.), but see explanatory note. $\tau \grave{2} \Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2 s}$ Sus., $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \Pi^{3}$ Bekk. 18. $\theta^{i} \beta \rho \omega \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: $\theta_{i}^{i} \beta \beta \rho \omega \nu \Pi^{1}$ Sus. 'Praestare videtur forma $\theta_{\imath} \beta$ pós, qua usus est Nicander, Alex. $568 \ldots$ Eandem varietatem in scriptura nominis proprii $\Theta i \mu \beta \rho \omega \nu$ et $\Theta i \beta \rho \omega \nu$ deprehendas' (Meineke, Analecta Alexandrina, p. 128). See also Meisterhans, Gramm. d. att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. 65 , who finds only the form $\Theta_{i} \beta \rho \omega \nu$ in Attic Inscriptions. For the frequent interchange of $\beta \rho$ and $\mu \beta \rho$ in MSS. see Mr. T. W. Allen in Journ. Hell. Studies 15.275. 20. Schneider, Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, and Sus. are probably right in adding $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ before $\pi$ лдıтєias. 21. $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \iota \grave{\eta} \eta \nu v ̂ \nu \gamma \epsilon \Pi \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus. (Vet. Int. quoniam nunc quidem): $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \iota \delta \grave{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\nu} \nu \mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$. 30. тò $\Pi$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ Sus. : $\tau \hat{̣}$ Scaliger, Bekk. ${ }^{2} \quad \Gamma$ probably had $\tau \dot{\prime}$, for Vet. Int. translates ad principari super vicinos, whereas he commonly translates $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi i$ with the dative by in or super. 33. $\delta \iota \omega$. $\kappa \epsilon \nu$ ] z has persequi probably rightly, for this is the word by which Vet. Int. renders $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ : the other MSS. of Vet. Int. have prosequi. 36. $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu$ (om. $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ ) кaì עó $\mu \omega \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: $\nu o ́ \mu \omega \nu$ каì $\lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \nu \Pi^{1}$ Sus. See critical note on I33I b 4 I. 37.
 Thurot and Sus. in adding ( $\tau \epsilon$ ) after $\tau o ́ \nu . ~ 41 . ~ \zeta \eta \tau \bar{\omega} \sigma \iota]$ Vet. Int. zelent ( $\zeta \eta \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \iota \Gamma$ ?).
 to heal the defect by rendering $\tau a ́ \xi \eta$ ordinis (see vol. ii. p. lxiv sq.). 8. àфı̂̄əı $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus., ảvıâoıv $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ and also $\mathrm{P}^{1}$, if Sus. ${ }^{12}$ and the 1882 edition of Sus. ${ }^{3}$, confirmed by St. Hilaire in his edition of the. Politics published in 1837 (vol. ii. p. 94), are to be trusted, though the 1894 reprint of $\mathrm{Sus}^{3}$ ascribes the reading àvıâбıv to $\Gamma \mathrm{Ms}$ only. It is difficult to tell from Vet. Int. rubiginem contrahunt what reading he found in his Greek text; he may possibly have found
 There is much to be said for àvtâनıv: cp. Plut. De Gen. Socr. c. 14,





 Bekk．：vimє $\epsilon$ є́ $\epsilon \iota \nu$ Sus．not，I think，rightly．19．$\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho o \nu a$ is bracketed by Sus．，and it is true that Aristotle adds no proof of the indis－ pensability of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma v v_{\eta}$ in the acquisition of necessaries，as he does in regard to àvopia and картєpía，but that it is indispensable we have seen in the explanatory note on 1334 a 19 （cp．also 1334 a 24）． 28．$\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta} s$ oủv к．， ．$^{2}$ ．］See explanatory note．30．ảmo入av́ovtas］ Vet．Int．frui（ảmo入av́єı $\Gamma$ ？）．36．тoîs ảyaOoîs om．pr． $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ ：тoîs
 nothing，but pr． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ has $\tau \hat{\omega} \mu \grave{\eta}$ in 37 in place of $\tau \grave{o} \mu \dot{\eta}$ ．Bekker omits тó．

1334b 2．$\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a i]$ See explanatory note on 1334 a 41 sub fin． 3．$\left.\epsilon \pi \epsilon \grave{i} \delta \grave{\epsilon} \kappa_{0} \tau_{.} \lambda_{0}\right]$ See explanatory note on 1334 a 4 I ．$\left.\tau \epsilon\right]$ tà $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ． Vet．Int．adds before haec，his equivalent for $\tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$ ，the words quam quae belli，which represent $\hat{\eta} \tau \dot{\alpha}$ tov̂ $\pi o \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu o v$ ，and $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ has $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \sigma \lambda \epsilon ́ \mu о v$ in the same place，but here a gloss has crept into the text of $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ，for $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ gives in red ink the gloss $\tau \grave{a} \pi \sigma \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \dot{\alpha} . \quad$ 12．${ }^{\epsilon} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$
 inferior MSS．and marg． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ，followed by Bekk．Sus．23．каì is added after $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ in $M^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus．：om．$\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．and perhaps $\Gamma$ ，for $z$ and almost all the MSS．of Vet．Int．consulted by Sus．omit et． 27．$\tau \eta{ }^{\nu} \nu \dot{\epsilon}$ tov $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．Sus．，$\tau o v ̂ ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s$ $\psi v \chi \eta \eta_{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ ，то仑̂ $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ тov̂ $\tau \rho i \not \tau o v ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi u \chi \hat{\eta} s \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ：Vet．Int．huiuus autem corum
 $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus．：we cannot tell from Vet．Int．fiant which reading he found in his text，for fiunt stands for $y^{\prime} \nu \omega \nu \tau a \iota$ in 1303 b 20 ．See critical note on 1339 a 13 ．39．$\tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ om． $\mathrm{P}^{2}{ }^{3}$ ．入iav om．$\Pi^{1}$ ．

1335 a 2．$\gamma \dot{\mu} \rho$ after $\tau \epsilon$ om．$\Pi^{1} . \quad$ 5．$\left.\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \dot{\beta} \eta \mu \epsilon \nu\right]$ Vet．Int．devenii－ mus．12．т $\boldsymbol{\tau} \nu$ before tєкขoтoiià om．$\Pi^{3} \mathrm{P}^{5}$ Bekk．，but probably wrongly：cp． 3 1， 39,1335 b 23， $4 \mathrm{I}, 1265$ a 40 ，b 7，1270a 40. The article is absent only in 1335 b 7，29．13．є̈ккога $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$

 and the Index Aristotelicus gives no other instance of the form
 Aristotle．See Meisterhans，Gramm．der att．Inschr．，ed．2，p．83， on the two forms：the form $\epsilon$ eryovos is the more common in Attic inscriptions．14，тaủtò тоиิтo $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．：аủтò тои̂тo $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus．，

 and after a lacuna pr. P1. Vet. Int. has lexatur (z et laxant: pr. a àlatur); possibly allocatur or allaudatur ('is allowed') is the

 reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain, for, as usual, Vet. Int. does not translate $\tau \epsilon$ 23. єivai om. $\Pi^{1}$, but these MSS. occasionally omit eivau. 25. $\delta \stackrel{\epsilon}{\epsilon} \mathrm{om}$. $\Pi^{1}$, but these MSS. often omit $\delta \epsilon \epsilon$. 26. $\sigma \pi \epsilon$ 白paros] See explanatory note on 1335 a $24 . \quad$ 27. $\pi \lambda \eta \theta$ viov $] \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ has a contraction which perhaps stands for $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$, and Vet. Int. has multum ( $=\pi o \lambda v ́$ ). Göttling and Sus. are probably right in trans-
 on 27 . 30. тобои́т $\Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{23}$, followed by Bekk. Sus.: тovía the
 Int. his quidem erit inchoante akmes, which probably stands for tois
 believes ăpXoнévns to be right, though he leaves àp $\chi_{\mu} \mu$ évors in his text.
 place of $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath} \chi \rho \eta \bar{j} \theta a u$ ois $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. The reading of $\Pi^{1}$ may be no more than an explanatory gloss on $\dot{\text { es }}$ which has crept into the text and taken the place of $\dot{\omega}$, a thing which sometimes happens to this family of MSS. (see critical note on 1255 b 12 ), but it is also true that $\Pi^{2}$ occasionally omit, though less often than $\Pi^{1}$, and I incline on the whole to think that $\Pi^{2}$ are in fault here. 39. $\hat{e} \dot{\epsilon} \Pi^{1}$ Sus.: $\delta \imath^{i}$ altered into $\delta \dot{\eta} \mathrm{P}^{3}$, $\delta \dot{\eta}$ the rest followed by Bekker.
 for Susemihl, is right) : $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a r \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ : $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau^{`} a ̀ \nu$ Cor. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. 'In Graecis codicibus non raro scribitur vitiose $\eta_{\text {そ̈ } \kappa \sigma \tau a, ~ \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~}^{\text {a }}$

 єiтєìv. 6. oủò̀ Coray, Bekk., Sus.: oüтє П. See explanatory note


 Sus., таvтò $\mathrm{P}^{1}$. каì is added before à $\nu \delta \partial \rho a ́ \sigma \iota ~ i n ~ \Pi \Pi^{1}$ Sus. 15. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ cì $\eta$ -
 qui de generatione honorem, but whether he found rais ciin $\eta$ viaus in his Greek text is doubtful. 18. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu a \Pi^{1}$ Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. (Vet. Int. quae generantur): đà $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\partial} \mu \mathrm{eva} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ See critical note on

1256 b 13．19．каì is added before тà фиó $\mu \in \nu a$ in $\Pi^{3}$ Bekk． 20. $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu о \mu \in ́ \nu \omega \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．${ }^{1}$ ， $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\iota \nu}{ }^{\prime} \mu_{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu \mathrm{M}^{8}$ Bekk．${ }^{2}$ ：$\gamma_{\epsilon \nu \rho \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu . ~ P 1 ~ S u s . ~ T h e ~}$ reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain（Vet．Int．genitorum）．21．єà̀ om．$\Pi^{1}$ Sus．， but the authority of these MSS．is small in omissions，and especially in omissions of small words．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu] \mathrm{z}$ alone of the MSS．of the Vet．Int．which have been examined has suetudinum：all the rest have gentium representing $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \theta \nu \omega \nu$ ，but probably a had suetudinum originally，for its present reading gentium is written over an erasure in a recent hand（see Sus．${ }^{1}$ ）．Schn．and Sus．take Leonardus Aretinus to have found $\hat{\epsilon}^{\dot{\epsilon}} \theta \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ in his Greek text in place of ${ }^{\epsilon} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$ ，but his rendering，as it stands in MS．Ball．242，is in aliis vero si mores institutaque civitatis prohibeant natos exponere，which seems to
 hand in $\mathrm{P}^{3}$（Bekk．к $\omega \lambda$ ím），＇$\kappa \omega \lambda$ v́o七（ut videtur）pr． $\mathrm{P}^{3}{ }^{\prime}$（Sus．），к $\omega \lambda$ véє $\Pi^{1}$ Sus．，but corr．${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{1}$（i．e．a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ in the same ink as the MS．）gives кшגı́ŋ．$\dot{\omega} i \sigma \theta a \iota \Gamma$ ，a correction in the margin of $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ， and corr．${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$（i．e．a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ in the same ink as the MS．）
 Bekker．23．$\delta \in i \quad \Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ pr． $\mathrm{P}^{13}$ Sus．，$\delta \dot{\eta}$ the rest followed by
 doubtful whether $\Gamma$ had $\sigma v v \delta v_{a \sigma \theta \in i \sigma \iota v, ~ f o r ~ i n ~} 1336$ a 9 Vet．Int． renders $\tau \eta \lambda_{\iota} \kappa 0$ út $\omega \nu$ by tantillos．25．$\mu \eta$ om．$\Pi^{2}$ ．28．хрウ̀ $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．：$\delta \epsilon \bar{i} \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus．and possibly $\Gamma$（see however critical note on 1281 а 17）．30．каӨáтєр тà тติע עє由тє́ $\rho \boldsymbol{\nu} \Pi$ ：Vet．Int．sicut et iuniorum：Sus．is inclined therefore to read каӨánєр каi $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \omega \bar{\nu}$ $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu$ ，but see critical notes on 1252 a 25,1262 a 29 ， 1264 a 9,
 кóvтడע $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ pr． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ：Vet．Int．decrepitorum，which probably represents $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \gamma є \gamma \eta \rho a \kappa o ́ \tau \omega \nu . \quad 35$ ．$\check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．Sus．：$\dot{\omega} \Pi^{1}$（Vet．Int．ut．．． oportet），but a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ in the same ink as the MS．gives ¢бтє．39．$\hat{\eta} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk．：кai $\Pi^{1}$ Sus．

1336 a 5．фаiveтаi $\tau \epsilon \mathrm{P}^{1} \Pi^{2}$ ，фаiveтaı тє̀ $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}}$ ：Vet．Int．apparet autem （фаivetal $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \Gamma$ ？）．But see critical notes on 1324 a 10 ， 1330 b 4 ， and $133^{2}$ a 42．6．ä ．$_{\epsilon \epsilon \nu} \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and perhaps r ，for Vet．Int．has inducere，and though äy $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\text { in }}$ usually rendered by ducere and sometimes by adducere in Vet．Int．，it is rendered by inducere in r306 a 3．Vict．placed eioriyelv in his text，taking inducere in Vet．Int．to represent eiacáctv，which no doubt it sometimes does （e．g．in 1320 a 14 ），but it does not always do so．No MS．appears



 єiod́y $\epsilon \nu$, would be possible alternatives for ä $\gamma \epsilon \epsilon \nu$. 7. $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ ova $\pi$, but the word is not included in the Index Aristotelicus and does not appear to occur elsewhere in Aristotle's writings : $\pi \lambda \eta$ Gíovaa Vict. Bekk. and Sus. probably rightly (Sus., however, does not place it in his text). $\Pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ occurs ' in Attic Prose only in the
 it is a poetical word ; still it may have been used by Aristotle, for
 poetical words. 9. $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ Ms $^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{123}$ etc. Bekk. Sus. : $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o u ́ \tau \omega$ $\mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{s}}$ : Vet. Int. tantillos, but it is doubtful whether he found
 $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus., סıaф́िєєөөa $\Pi^{1}$ (for Vet. Int. has defluere, which perhaps should be diffluere), except that pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ had $\delta$ oaṕ́ $\rho \theta a$. . See
 $\pi \rho \dot{d} \xi \in \epsilon \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus.: Ms ${ }^{1}$ omit the second $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ (see critical note on I33 I b 24): about $\Gamma$ we cannot be certain, for Vet. Int. commonly repeats the preposition in sentences of this kind, whether he finds it in the Greek or not (see critical note on 1253 a $3^{6}$ ). 17. $\psi v \chi \rho^{\circ} \nu$ is bracketed by Sus., who follows $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ corr. $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ in reading $\psi v \chi \rho o$ ò in place

 represented by habitudo in Vet. Int., and not, I think, elsewhere in





 סıaááveıs] Vet. Int. cohibitiones: cp. 39, where dıareıvoúvoos is rendered qui cohibentur. 35. кai $\Pi$ Bekk. : Vet. Int. in ploratibus, so that he probably found кarà in $\Gamma$, which Sus. reads instead of кai.. roùs is added before $\kappa \lambda a v \theta \mu$ oùs in $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{B}} \mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{t}}$ Sus.: whether in $\Gamma$ also,
 the 1894 edition of Sus. ${ }^{3}$ ), a suggestion which I cannot follow Susemihl in adopting. See for the force of roîs novoūou explanatory note on 1336 a 37 .

1336 b 2. àmoえav́єt̀ Ms $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus., à àoдaßeiv $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. absumere),
 Ald. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ and pr. $\mathrm{P}^{4}$, $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \nu \theta \epsilon \rho \dot{a} a \nu$ corr. $\mathrm{P}^{4}$. T T $\omega \nu$ à $\nu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \theta_{\epsilon} \rho \omega \nu$ is evidently a correction intended to suit the false reading à $\pi \epsilon \lambda a \dot{v} v \epsilon \iota$. See critical note on I340 b 14 . For кai before $\tau \eta \lambda \iota \kappa o v ́ r o u s ~ z ~ h a s ~$ etiam probably rightly: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. et. 8. $\tau \omega \bar{\nu}$
 on I33I a 34 and I314 b 26 . 14. є̈ $\sigma \tau \omega \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Ar. Bekk. Sus., évть
 words, which I have bracketed, are found in $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and are inserted by Sus. in his text: Vet. Int. has eos qui habent aetatem amplius provectam, which probably represents Bekker's reading, тoùs ëxovtas $\dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa i a \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma \nu \pi \rho o \eta к o u \sigma a \nu$, a reading found only in $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ and there probably adopted from the Vet. Int. ( $\pi \lambda \epsilon^{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu$ over an erasure in $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ ):

 think that $\Pi^{2}$ are right, and that the words added in $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and also those added in $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{5}$ are merely a gloss intended to complete the sense, which has crept from the margin into the text. The MSS. of the first family occasionally admit glosses into their text (see vol. ii. p. lvii). ${ }^{*}$ Etı in the reading of $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1} \mathrm{I}$ do not understand. 19. каï $\gamma v \nu a \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ om. $\Gamma \mathrm{MI}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{pr} . \mathrm{P}^{1}$. тєцадфєі̀ $\Pi^{2}$



 Ar. Sus., before these words the rest followed by Bekker. 27. ívos $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к. т. $\lambda_{\text {.] }}$ ] See explanatory note. 30. $\theta \epsilon a \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \Pi^{2}$ corr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ Bekk.: $\theta \epsilon \dot{\alpha} \tau \rho \omega \nu \Gamma$ Ms pr. P ${ }^{1}$ Sus. See critical note on $133^{8}$ b 23 .
 but probably these are two alternative readings, both of them incorrect, which have taken the place of infensionem, the true equivalent for $\delta v \sigma \mu \in \operatorname{vetav}$, while malitiam, the true equivalent for $\mu_{0}$ Olpiav, has been omitted. The original rendering of Vet. Int. probably was aut malitiam aut infensionem. 36. $\eta^{\eta} \delta \eta \mathrm{om} . \Pi^{1}$. 38. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ before $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a \nu$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{8}$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$. $\left.\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a}\right]$ See explanatory note on $133^{6}$ b 37. 39. $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \chi \rho \iota ~ \eta ̋ \beta \eta s \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota s$ $\tilde{\eta} \beta \eta$ s $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus. and possibly r . In 1319 b 12 , on the other hand,
 Attic inscriptions $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota$ does not become $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota s$ before a vowel (Meisterhans, Gramm. der att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. 180). Phrynichus'
 the ' $A \theta$. $\Pi$ o $\lambda$. this rule is observed, as will be seen from Dr. Sandys' Index. In Eth. Nic. 7. 7. 1149 b 13, however, $\mathrm{K}^{\mathrm{b}}$ and all the MSS. appear to have $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \iota s$ éviav̂ $\theta a$.

1337 a 1. какюิs Muretus, Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. : калิิs г $\Pi$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ In 1294 a $7 \Pi^{1}$ have калิิs wrongly in place of какढิs. 7. $\left.\delta \epsilon i\right]$ ठєíraı Ms: Vet. Int. oportet esse ( $\delta \in i ̂ \epsilon i v a \iota ~ \Gamma$ ?).

BOOK V (VIII).
 Ar. Sus. (Aretinus' translation being oportet enim ad singula gubernandi genera disciplinam accommodari) : $\pi ⿰ \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \cup \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ Г ~ \Pi ~ B e k k . ~ I n ~$

 $\beta \epsilon \in \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \nu] ~ \beta \epsilon ́ \lambda \tau \iota o \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ Ar. Sus. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ : the rest $\beta$ é $\lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau o \nu$ followed by Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ Bonitz (Ind. 403 a $I_{5}$ sqq.) appears to accept $\beta$ '́̇ $\lambda \tau \sigma \tau o \nu$,
 aủrò̀ av́rov̂ $\tau \iota \nu a ̀ ~ \epsilon i v a \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu]$ Vet. Int. simul autem neque oportet putare civium ipsorum aliquem sibi esse, so that $\Gamma$ probably had
 biguous contraction in place of av̉ròv, followed by aủ兀 $\hat{\omega}$ : almost all the other MSS. have aủtòv aủtov̂. 29. $\mu$ ópıov . . . $\pi$ ó $\lambda \epsilon \omega s$ om. $\Pi^{1}$.
 muniter), коьิิs $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ (Sus. кoıv̂̀). 36. $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : $\delta \grave{a} \Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{pr}$. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ Sus. See explanatory note. 40. oủȯè $\mathrm{P}^{23}$ etc. Bekk.: oúȯ $\epsilon \nu \grave{\imath}$ $\Pi^{1} P^{4}$ Sus.
 $\theta \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$ ] Schneider conjectures $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \rho i \omega \nu$, and perhaps $\Gamma$ had $\epsilon \grave{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon \theta \epsilon \rho i \omega \nu$, for Vet. Int. has liberalibus. 6. ùvє $\lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu]$ ảvє$\lambda_{\epsilon} \epsilon \in \epsilon \operatorname{\rho i\omega \nu } \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. illiberalibus, but illiberalis commonly represents $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \epsilon \rho o s)$. 11. $\hat{\eta} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$ is bracketed by Sus., who says in Qu. Crit. p. 418, 'si סıávoua pars animae est, expectas $\hat{\eta} \theta$ os pro $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta} v$, ' but for the use of $\psi v \chi \dot{\eta}$ in the sense of $j$ $\begin{aligned} \\ \text { os compare (with Bonitz, Ind. } 866 \text { a 3) c. } 5.1340 \text { a } 6 \text {; cp. also }\end{aligned}$

 addition of these words not noticed by Sus. is that there is no reference to them in $11-15$, as there is to rò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ and rì̀ $\delta$ oávotav,
but for a similar inexactness of reference cp． 4 （7）．1．1323 b 33 sqq． and other passages．12．$\tau \epsilon$ om． $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly r ，but $\Pi^{1}$ often omit $\tau \epsilon$ ．16．＇$\tau o ̀ ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \ldots 20$ ，áv $\nu \lambda \epsilon \dot{\prime} \theta \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$ om． $\mathrm{P}^{236} \mathrm{C}^{4} \mathrm{~S}^{b} \mathrm{~T}^{b}$ $L^{s}$ Ald．pr． $\mathrm{P}^{4}$（suppl．marg． $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ ），＇Sus．${ }^{1}$ тò $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \rho \circ \sigma \epsilon \delta \rho \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu \mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．assiduare autem）：om．pr． $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ in a lacuna， $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon \delta \rho \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \iota \nu$ ס̀̀ a recent correction in $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ followed by Bekker．But $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ is a MS．of little or no authority and a recent correction in $\mathrm{P}^{5}$ counts for even less than the MS．17．$\pi$ pòs ákpíßєıà $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ marg． $P^{4}$ Sus．：the words fall within the passage omitted by $\Pi^{2}$ ：Vet． Int．ad perfectionem，which may perhaps represent $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ k p i ́ \beta \epsilon \epsilon a \nu ~$ （though Vict．and Bekk．take it to represent $\pi \rho \rho^{\prime}$ тò̀ $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \grave{s}$ and adopt this reading），for Vet．Int．translates $\epsilon$ is ákpißєtav by ad certi－ tudinem in 1331 a 2，ákpißєıav by certitudinem in 1328 a 20 ，and $\tau \hat{\eta}$ áкрıßeía by diligentia in 1274 b 7 ，and he may well have used
 P1 Sus．：$\chi$ ápı̀ P5 Bekk．：$\Pi^{2}$ omit $16-20$ ：Vet．Int．gratia may
 avirov̂ $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ रà $\rho \mathrm{P}^{5}$ Bekk．：Vet．Int．ipsius quidem enim gratia may represent either reading．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ is added before $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu$ in $\mathrm{P}^{5} .20$. av̉兀ò тоиิтo］тaủ兀ò тои̂тo Richards．$\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ Bekk．Sus．：$\pi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu$ $\Pi^{2}$ ：the reading of $\Gamma$ is of course uncertain．$\pi о \lambda \lambda$ त́кıs $\delta i^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda$ dous $\Pi^{1}$ Sus．probably rightly（see explanatory note on 1255 b 2）：$\Pi^{2}$ Bekk．
 and probably $\Gamma$（Vet．Int．dictum est）．25．тウ̀v $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu \ldots \gamma \rho a \phi \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu$ om．

 1337 b 34．36．àvayкaîov］See explanatory note on 1337 b 35.



1338 a 8．aن́rติข $\Gamma$ and $\Pi^{2}$（except $\mathrm{P}^{4}$ Ald．，which have aủv $\omega \hat{\nu}$ ） Bekk．Sus．：aủ兀ウ̀̀ $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ pr． $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ ，aùt $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ in the ink of the MS．10．$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \delta t a \gamma \omega \gamma \bar{\eta} \sigma^{\chi}{ }^{\circ} \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ ］See explanatory note on 1338 a 9．16．кaì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu a ́ \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu ~ i s ~ b r a c k e t e d ~ b y ~ S u s ., ~ ' n i s i ~ c o r-~$ ruptum potius est $\mu a ́ \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$＇（Sus．）．25．$\Pi^{1}$ place кàєìv after $\epsilon$ ध́ $\pi i$ סaîta．See critical note on $\mathbf{r} 328$ a $\mathbf{1 5}$ ．Vet．Int．translates the line sed est quidem velut ad epulas vocari congaudere．Vocari may well represent kaдєiv（see vol．ii．p．lxiii，note 6），and congaudere probably stands for some corruption of $\theta a \lambda \epsilon i \eta \nu$ or else for a mar－ ginal gloss $\sigma v \nu \in \cup \phi \rho a i v e \sigma \theta a r$ ．As to $\dagger \mu \epsilon \grave{\nu}+$ see explanatory note on 1338 a 24．I propose to read $\mu$ óvov in place of $i t$ ．26．о̂ кa－
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \sigma v \sigma \iota \nu$ ] See explanatory note on 1338 a 24 . 27. ס́] $\tilde{\omega}^{\prime} \Pi^{1}$ (Vet. Int. tanquam delectantem omnes): ös P4. I add $\delta$ before 'Oóvorєùs because the Homeric Odysseus is referred to. 28. öтaע к. т. $\lambda_{\text {. }}$ ] Vet. Int. quando gaudentibus hominibus 'congregati super tecta audiunt philomenam sidentes deinceps,' where congregati should perhaps be convivati, and philomenam philomelam. He appears either to have found ảךסóvos in his Greek text in place of ảoıovo or to have misread ḋo七ôv̂ as ảnóóvos. 31. àvaүкаíav $\Pi^{1}$ Bekk. Sus., ảvaүкаîov $\Pi^{2}$. 33. $\mu i a \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus., $\mu i ́ a \nu \Pi^{1}$. тò̀ ápı $\theta \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: $\tau \hat{̣}$ $\dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \theta \mu \hat{\varphi} \mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. numero), Sus.
$1338 \mathrm{~b} 1 . \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu]$ ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{a} \quad \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ Reiz, Thurot, Sus.: $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \hat{\eta}$ Postgate. See explanatory note. $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\partial} \nu \Pi^{1}$ Bekk. Sus. : $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta-$ $\tau \iota \kappa \grave{̀ \nu} \Pi^{2}$. 3. áp $\quad$ óт $\tau \epsilon \iota \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : á $\rho \mu o ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$, Sus. $\mathrm{M}^{5} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly T have áp $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{o}}^{5}$ ovora in I 288 b 24 , where $\Pi^{2}$ Vat.
 used by all MSS., but I have not noticed any other passages in the Politics in which the form áp $\mu$ ót $\tau \epsilon \iota$ is not used in all the MSS. ' In Attic inscriptions áp $\boldsymbol{o}^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega$ is the only form in use : $\dot{a} \rho \mu o ́ \zeta \omega$ is nowhere found' (Meisterhans, Gramm. der att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. I4 I).
 correction in $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ in the same ink as the MS. and therefore probably by the writer of it, Demetrius Chalcondylas): по́тєроу Г П. 5. $\epsilon i v a i$ om. $\Pi^{1}$, but these MSS. often omit fival, and here the omission of tivat suits the erroneous reading пóтєрov, 4. 11. тá $\tau \in \epsilon \in i \not \eta \eta$ ] Vet. Int. et speciem, but see critical note on 1287 a 27. 23. $\lambda_{\eta \sigma r \rho \iota \kappa \grave{a}} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ Ald. (the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain), $\lambda_{\eta \sigma \tau \rho \iota k \grave{a}}$ Sus.: $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \iota k a ̀ ~ \mathrm{P}^{2}$, $\lambda$ そ́ïбтıка pr. $\mathrm{P}^{3}$, $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \iota \kappa a$ rec. $\mathrm{P}^{3}$, $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{a}$ Bekk. A $\eta \sigma \tau \rho \iota \kappa \grave{a}$ may be right, for in $1256 \mathrm{~b}, 5$ (the only other passages of Aristotle to which the Index Aristotelicus refers for either of these words) the form used is $\lambda_{\eta \sigma \tau \rho เ к o ́ s . ~}^{T}$ and $\tau \rho$ are easily confused ; thus in $1336 \mathrm{~b} 30 \Pi^{2}$ have $\theta \in a \tau \omega ิ \nu$ and $\Pi^{1} \theta \in a ́ \tau \rho \omega \nu$, and in 1274 a 39 we find $\gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ in $\Pi^{2}$ in place of $\tau a \phi \eta \eta^{2}$. On the whole, therefore, I incline to follow $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and to read $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \rho \iota \alpha \dot{\alpha}$. Both
 passages and $\lambda \eta \sigma \tau \rho \iota к o ́ s$ in two (see Von Essen's Index). 26. кai
 тоîs $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa o i ̂ s ~ a ̀ \gamma \omega ิ \sigma \iota ~ \Pi ~ B e k k . ~ 28 . ~ \tau \hat{̣} ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu] ~ \mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ \tau \hat{̣}$ Reiz, Richards, but possibly $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu o \nu$ is here displaced as ou $\mu \dot{0} \nu o \nu$ sometimes is, e.g. in De An. 3. 6. 430 b 4 sq. (Bon. Ind. s. v. $\mu$ óvos).

has been changed into ou than that ou has been changed into ouvit. Compare the readings in 1293 a 7 and see critical note on 1261 b 7 . oùסغ́ $\tau \omega ิ \nu \not ̈ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ Onpi $\omega \nu$ ] Vet. Int. neque aliarum ferarum aliqua, but whether he found $\tau \iota$ added in $\Gamma$ after $\theta \eta \rho i \omega \nu$ may well be doubted.

 II2I bir (the only other reference for either word given in the


1339 a 1. סúvavtaı $\Pi^{1} L^{8}$ Ald. Sus.: סúvataı $\mathrm{P}^{234}$ etc. Bekk. See
 possibly $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. fiunt). 11. $\delta \iota \eta \pi о р \eta ́ к а \mu \epsilon \nu \mathrm{Ms}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably
 тaє $\Pi$ : the reading of $\Gamma$ is of course uncertain (Vet. Int. fiat): rivqrat? Sus. But cp. 4 (7). 16. 1334 b 29 sq., where $\Pi^{2}$ and pos-
 rest: the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain. 18. ov̈т $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \pi o v \delta a i \omega \nu]$ z has neque shudiosorum: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. have neque studiosorum sunt. ã $\mu a \pi a v ́ є \iota ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \iota \mu \nu a \nu ~ \Pi \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$ : ä $\mu a \mu \dot{\mu} \rho \iota \mu \nu a \nu \pi a v \in \iota \Pi^{1}$ Sus.: àvaтav́єє $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \iota \mu \nu a \nu$ Göttling, Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ perhaps rightly (cp. Eurip. Bacch. $33^{2}$ sqq. Bothe, quoted in explanatory note on 1339 a 17 ). 20. v̈ $\pi \nu \omega$ Ar., Reiz, Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, Sus.: oìvఱ Г $\Pi$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$. Oỉvos and $\tilde{v} \pi \nu o s$ are often interchanged in the MSS.: see Meineke, Hist. Crit. Com. Gr. p. 393. 22. $\tau \iota$ om. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, but not $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ (Vet. Int. secundum
 om. Г Ms. 25. каì прòs фрóvךбıข] See explanatory note on 1339a 26. 29. $\gamma \epsilon \pi a \iota \sigma i \nu \mathrm{P}^{1}, \tau \epsilon \pi a \iota \sigma i \nu \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. ${ }^{1}$, $\pi a \iota \sigma i \nu \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ : the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain, for Vet. Int. seldom renders $\gamma \epsilon$ or $\tau \epsilon$ (he has deductionem pueris here). I read $\gamma \epsilon \pi a \iota \sigma^{i} \nu$ with $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ Coray and Eucken (De Partic. Usu, p. I5) : see explanatory note and Class. Rev. 7. 305, note I. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ reads $[\tau \epsilon]$ maı $\sigma i \nu . \quad$ 30. oủ $\theta \epsilon \nu \grave{̀}$
 same mistake in 1255 a 39. 33. ס́є́九 $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus. : $\delta \in \imath \uparrow \Gamma$ Me pr. P1 (Vet. Int. oportet). 35. $\delta \iota^{\prime}$ om. $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ Bekk. 39. Richards may well be right in adding tà before $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$. See explanatory note. 40. âv om. $\Pi^{\prime}$, but these MSS. occasionally omit ${ }^{*} \nu$.

1339 b 4. єỉ $\Pi^{1} \mathrm{P}^{4}$, єỉך the rest. 21. yoûv $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : yàp $\Pi^{1}$ Sus.: see critical note on 1285 a 12 26. Vet. Int. translates ảd入à kaì by sed, as in 4 I . 33. ס̀̀ om. $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{pr} . \mathrm{P}^{1}$. 37. oiov om. Г Ms pr. P'.

1340 a 6. Ms $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ omit the second $\pi \rho \mathrm{o}^{2}$. See critical note on
$133 \times$ b 24. 12. Vet. Int. gives no equivalent for $\dot{\alpha} к \rho о \dot{\omega} \mu \in \nu o t$, a bm leaving a lacuna before the equivalent for $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \iota \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ :
 in a lacuna. 13. pr. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ leaves a lacuna between $\chi \omega \rho$ is and $\dot{\rho} \nu \theta \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$ in which $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ has disappeared, and there was probably a lacuna in the same place in $\Gamma$, for several MSS. of the Vet. Int. leave a lacuna between the equivalents for $\chi \omega \rho i s$ and $\rho \dot{\rho} v \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$, but whether $\Gamma$ omitted $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ it is impossible to tell from Vet. Int.

 31. See explanatory note. 34. тav̂т' $\Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: toût' $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \grave{\imath} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk.: ảmò $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. 'E $\pi \grave{\imath}$ appears to be right: see Plut. Sympos.9.15.2, quoted in explanatory note on $\mathrm{r} 340 \mathrm{a} 34 . \quad 36$. $\pi a v ́ \sigma \omega \nu o s \Pi^{1}$ Bekk. Sus., $\pi \dot{\sigma} \sigma \omega \nu o s \mathrm{P}^{2356}$ etc. and pr. $\mathrm{P}^{4}$. But in Poet. 2. I448 a 6 Ac has $\pi a v ́ \sigma \omega \nu$ and in Metaph. Ө. 8. 1050 a 20, where some MSS. have $\pi a ́ \sigma \omega \nu o s$ or $\pi \alpha ́ \sigma \sigma \omega \nu o s, \mathrm{E}$ has $\pi a v \dot{\sigma} \sigma \nu o s$. The artist referred to in this passage of the Metaphysics was a sculptor, and Pauson was a painter, but he may have been a sculptor also. For the frequent interchange of $a$ and $a v$ in MSS. see Mr. T. W. Allen in Journ. Hell. Studies, I5. 289. 37. кầv či] Vet. Int. et si, but see critical note on 1278 b 7 . 41. кai $\mu \dot{\eta}$ ] $z$ has et non: all the other MSS. of Vet. Int. have sed non.
 үà $\rho \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. 8. т̀̀ om. $\Pi^{3}$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ : Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ brackets it. . 10.
 z has qualem quendam in agreement with morem animae: the other

 reading ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \chi$ Є८. See critical note on 1336 b 3, where these MSS. similarly correct $a v \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \theta \epsilon p i a \nu$, 16. z has natura rightly for $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota$ : is naturae in Sus. ${ }^{1}$ a misprint? 17. As to $\dot{\eta} \delta \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$ see explanatory note on 1340 b 16. 20. roùs is wrongly added before aúroùs in $\Pi^{1}$ : z has eos for rov̀s aùrov̀s, but the other MSS. of Vet. Int. are probably right in reading eosdem. 22. $\delta \dot{\eta}$ $\mathrm{P}^{123}$ : $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ the rest (Vet. Int. autem), followed by Bekk. and doubtfully by Sus. 24. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ коьข$\omega \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma a \nu \tau a s]$ Vet. Int. eos qui non communicaverunt, but this may well stand for $\mu \dot{\eta}$ коьขшข $\dot{\eta} \sigma \nu \tau a s:$ cp. 128I a 30, where qui non honorantur stands for $\mu \grave{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \omega \mu$ évous, 1335 a 24, where quae usae fuerunt stands for хрпбá $\mu \boldsymbol{\nu a \iota , ~} 1336$ a 39, where pueris qui cohibentur stands for тoîs matoiots òtarєıvopévots,
and 1322a 4, where qui sustinent stands for írousivavres. See critical note on 1269 a 18 , though I have now little doubt that qui mutaverit there stands not for $\dot{o} \kappa \iota \nu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma a s$ but for кıv $\eta \sigma a s . ~ 26$. áp ${ }^{\text {útov }} \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. and a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ in the same ink as the MS. : ápұúta M¹ pr. P1 Sus. : we cannot tell from Vet. Int. Archyiae which form he found in his text. It is doubtful whether Aristotle wrote 'A $\rho \chi$ úra, for though in I3II b 4 all MSS. but one or two have $\delta \epsilon \in \rho \delta a$, they have á $\mu v \dot{\nu \tau o v}$ in the preceding line, and we find iop $\quad$ piou in Rhet. 2. 23. 1398 b 4 and eviaqópuv in Rhet. 2. 23. 1399 a 4. In Pol. 6 (4). I3. 1297 a 23, again, all MSS. have $\chi a \rho \dot{\omega} \nu \delta o v$, not $\chi$ ap $\omega \nu \delta a$ as in Strabo, p. 539. As to the usage in Attic inscriptions Meisterhans (Gramm. der att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. 94) reports, 'Foreign personal names ending in -as in Athenian public documents of the fifth and fourth century в.c. form the genitive in -ov, not -a (Пєрסíkкov, 'A $\quad$ v́vtov, 'Apúßßov, and so forth). On the other hand $-a$ occurs in a private inscription in the name of an Athenian (Xaıpe $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \circ v$ Фıлє́a in an Attic inscription of the fifth century в. c.).' On the whole the chances are in favour of ipxúrov. In the nominative we have à artцє
 17 , though the forms in -as are the local forms. $\quad$ 32. kai om. $\Pi^{1}$.
 from Vet. Int. factam which reading he found in his Greek text, for in 1337 a 13 factum stands for $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu o ́ \mu \in \nu o \nu$.

1341 a 8. $\pi \rho \rho_{s} \mu \grave{\varphi} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda$.] See explanatory note on I341 a 7. 13. кai om. $\Pi^{1}$ Sus., but the authority of these MSS. is weak in omissions and especially in omissions of кai. 15. ко七ע $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ rightly : the rest $\kappa o \iota \nu \omega \nu \hat{\omega}$. 18. $\tau \iota$ is added in $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. after
 probably r (Vet. Int. alterum est), for Vet. Int. usually renders
 ${ }^{*} A \lambda \lambda_{0}$ is probably repeated from the preceding line. 29. $\tau \eta \nu$ which Bekker omits before d $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ is omitted only in a few MSS. of little authority. 33. aủròs om. $\Pi^{1}$.
 2. єủ̉óyตs] z has rationabiliter rightly: the other MSS. of Vet. Int. have rationaliter. $3 . \delta \dot{\eta}$ om. $\Pi^{\prime}$. 4. Vet. Int. has enim for $\mu \dot{\epsilon} v$ oủv (or possibly $\mu \dot{\nu} \nu$, for pr. $M^{8}$ omits oủv in a lacuna), but see critical note on 1252 a 24 . 11. aúroû $\Gamma$ (Vet. Int. suimet) Bekk. Sus.: aùтoû ח. 19-26. I retain $\delta^{\prime}$ after $\sigma \kappa \in \pi \tau i ́ o v$, thinking that its
presence in the text is due simply to the fact that owing to the long parenthesis, $10-\mathbf{1 8}$, Aristotle has forgotten that his protasis needs an apodosis. I bracket kaì $\pi \rho \dot{s}$ пaiò́iav, because, as Bonitz points out (Aristot. Stud. 2 and 3, p. 97 sq.), there is no such limitation in the solution of the problem given in 1342 a 1 sqq. חpòs $\pi a \Delta \delta \epsilon i a \nu$ has probably been repeated from the line below. In

 reading, it will be necessary, as Sus. sees, in order to obtain an apodosis, to translate kai, 25 , 'also,' or else, which Sus. prefers, to expunge it. I feel inclined to suggest a greater change. Should not rpitov $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ be bracketed and $\epsilon \tau \tau \iota \epsilon$ be read in place of
 a marginal gloss which has crept into the text, just as $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \neq \boldsymbol{\nu} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ has done in some MSS. in 1265 a 2 I. I have obelized $\tau$ pícov. . . $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \pi \epsilon \delta \dot{\eta}$ to "indicate that the soundness of the text is doubtful. I thought better of the state of the text in 19-26 when I wrote vol. i. p. $3^{666}$, than I do now. 23. z has quoniam autem for
 $\mu$ épos ГП Bekk. : $\mu$ énos Tyrwhitt, Sus. possibly rightly. 38. каi is added after $\gamma$ à $\rho$ in $\mathrm{P}^{124}$. 40. тpítov $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$.] See explanatory note.
 the reading of $\Gamma$ is uncertain: ${ }_{\epsilon} \kappa \delta^{\delta} \dot{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mathrm{P}^{46} \mathrm{~L}^{8}$ Ald. Bekk. 10.
 restitutas). 11. ठウ̀] Vet. Int. autem (ঠ̀̀ $\Gamma$ ?). 15. кaӨapтıкà $\Gamma$ П Bekk. : $\pi \rho a k \tau \iota<\grave{a}$ Sauppe, Sus. See explanatory note. 17. $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$
 18. $\theta_{\varepsilon a \tau \rho \kappa \kappa i ̀ \nu}$ om. $\Gamma^{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and pr . $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ (it appears as a red-ink gloss in $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ ). Sus. brackets it. The Index Aristotelicus does not give any other instance of the use of the word $\theta_{\text {ear } \rho \kappa \text { кós. }}$
24. тараке$\chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu^{\text {éva }} \mathrm{P}^{3} \Pi^{3}$ Bekk. Sus. : $\pi а р а к є \chi \omega \rho \eta \mu$ ย́va $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and probably $r: z$ has discretae perhaps rightly (see Sus. ${ }^{1}$, p. 368), and this no doubt represents $\pi а р а к є \chi \omega р \eta \mu$ éva. 34. каталєíধє1] Vet. Int. admittit.

1342 b 10. тoùs $\mu \mathrm{v}$ Oous $Г$ П : тoùs Mvaò̀s Schn. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ Sus. probably rightly. 17. đoîs $\nu \epsilon \omega$ тépoos] See explanatory note on
 19. éка́atoıs $\mathrm{P}^{5}$, followed by Bekk. and Sus. : éкќgrovs the rest: we cannot tell from Vet. Int. quae decent singulos what reading he found in r. 21. xpóvov $\mathrm{P}^{35} \Pi^{3}$ and perhaps $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{B}}$ (rightly, cp.

1329a 33) : the rest, including probably $\boldsymbol{\Gamma}$ (Vet. Int. per tempus), have $\chi$ рóvov. Bekk. reads $\chi \rho$ póvov, Sus. $\chi$ рóvov. 23. (т̂̂) $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \epsilon \epsilon]$ So J. C. Wilson followed by Sus.: $\sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \epsilon t$ In. We expect $\tau \bar{̣}$ $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho$ áret, as the Socrates of the Republic ( 398 E ) is referred to. If
 in Rhet. r. 9 . 1367 b 8 (the same quotation) we have $\delta$ $\delta \omega \kappa \rho a ́ r \eta s$. 26. As petulantia impetuosum is the equivalent for ßaкरevtıkòv in Vet. Int., the parenthesis in Sus. ${ }^{1}$ p. 37 r which ends after magis should begin before petulantia, not before impetuosum. 29. Schn. Cor. and Göttling place a colon, not a full stop, after тoooút $\omega \nu$, but see explanatory note. $\quad 33 . \hat{\eta}$ is added after $\dot{\alpha} \rho \mu o \nu \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ by $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ and corr. ${ }^{1} \mathrm{P}^{2}$ (i.e. a correction in $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ in the same ink as the MS.), followed by Sus., who however places the mark of a lacuna after $\hat{\eta}$. Göttling reads $\bar{\eta}$ in place of $\hat{\eta}$, comparing 2. 10. 1272 b 9 . Schn. and Cor. omit $\hat{\eta}$ and add ouvy after $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o v .34$. I follow Vet. Int., Sus., and others in indicating a lacuna after $\pi \rho \notin \pi$ ког: see vol. ii. p. xxix.

## NOTES.

## BOOK III.

 Attention has already been called (above on 1274 b 26 ) to the 1274 b . absence of any connecting particle. חò七reias is probably not the acc. plur., as some take it to be, but the gen. sing. as in




 $\dot{\epsilon \pi} \pi \epsilon \sigma \kappa о \pi \sigma \hat{\nu} \mu \epsilon \nu$. From what has been said at the end of the First and the beginning of the Second Book we expect to be invited here to inquire into the nature of the best constitution, not into the nature of each constitution (see vol. i. p. 226), but the programme of the Politics given at the close of the Nicomachean Ethics contemplates an inquiry into the due structure of each constitution, and it is clear from Pol. I. 13. 1260 b i2, èv roîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{̀}$ tàs $\pi$ onıteías, that Aristotle intends to study all constitutions, not the best only.
ris ékáaテŋ kaì moía tıs. This inquiry is taken up in the Sixth and following chapters. The question ris kaì moia $\tau \iota s$ is characteristic of Science (Eth. Nic. 1. 7. 1098 a 29, каì үàp тéктшу каì

 tinction between ris and moia tes recurs in Pol. 6 (4). I. 1288 b 2 I sqq. and I. $3 .{ }^{12} 53$ b 7 sq. As to its nature, if we refer to Eth. Nic.

 to take $\tau$ is in the passage before us as asking what is the genus, and moia ris as asking what is the differentia, but it would seem that the answer to ris is rather the definition, while the answer to moia $\tau, s$ is given in further illustrative details, and that the sense
of the words is 'what is the nature of each and how each may be described.' Cp. Plato, Gorg. $448 \mathrm{E}, \Pi \Omega \Lambda$. ov̉ $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\text {à } \rho ~ a ̀ \pi \epsilon к р \iota \nu \alpha ́ \mu \eta \nu, ~ o ̈ \tau \iota ~}$





 Symp. 201 E, Euthyphr. if A, Meno 7x B, Rep. 328 E, and
 where Ramsauer thinks that $\hat{\eta} \pi 0 i o ́ v \tau \iota$ is added because Aristotle feels that he fails in what follows to give a precise definition of pleasure. In Plato, Rep. 557 B sqq. in answer to the question тoía тıs $\dot{\eta}$ тotav́т $\pi$ тo入ıтєia a description of a State democratically governed is given.
33. $\pi \in \rho i$ mó $\lambda \epsilon \omega s$ is of course to be taken, not with $\sigma \kappa$ ќ $\psi \iota s$, but with iofiv.

34 sqq. Aristotle gives three reasons for inquiring into the nature of the $\pi$ ó $\lambda \iota s$ before passing on to the $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a:-\mathrm{r}$. The nature of the $\pi$ ón $\iota$ s is a disputed question. 2. The statesman and the lawgiver are concerned with the $\pi$ ó $\lambda \iota s$, hence an inquiry into its nature is not only needed but belongs to the province of the $\pi$ $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \iota \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$. 3. The constitution (which is the subject of his treatise) is an ordering of those who dwell in the $\pi$ óncs. As to the first reason, see c. 3.1276 a 6 sqq. and notes, and compare also (with Eaton) Thuc. 3. 62. 4 sq. As to the second reason, cp. Eth. Nic.
 (i. e. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu) \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \pi \epsilon \pi \sigma \nu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$, where a similar reason is given for the study of virtue. As to the third, we learn from c. 6. 1278 b 8 sqq., 6 (4). I. 1289 a $\mathbf{I}_{5}$ sqq., and 6 (4).3. 1290 a 7 sqq. what kind of ordering a constitution is (Sus. ${ }^{2}$, note $43^{2}$ b: Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. p. 354). Aristotle's inquiry into the nature of the $\pi \sigma^{\prime} \lambda \iota s$ and the citizen helps him to answer the question which he takes up later on, what a $\pi$ oдıreia is, because it discloses that the $\pi$ ólıs is an aggregate of citizens, or in other words of men possessing access to office and therefore either actual or possible rulers, and thus leads on to the conclusion arrived at in c. 6 , that the $\pi$ o $\lambda \iota \tau$ eia is an ordering of the offices of the módis and especially of its supreme office ( 1278 b 8 sq .). The fact that the $\pi$ ódes consists of actual or possible rulers also suggests the further conclusion that it is
 mo八ırєia the kind of rule exercised is not the rule of a master over his slaves but rule for the common good．Thus the inquiry into the nature of the $\pi \sigma^{\lambda} \iota s$ and the citizen is fruitful of important results．It also incidentally discloses the existence of a plurality of constitutions differing from one another．It will be observed that Aristotle conceives the statesman to be concerned only with the $\pi{ }^{\prime} \lambda_{i s}$ ，not with the $\ddot{\epsilon} \theta \nu o s$ ，an error into which he was possibly led in part by the use of the word mo入ıтוкós to designate a statesman． The $\bar{\epsilon} \theta \nu o s$, whether in the form of an aggregate of cities or of villages，certainly deserved to be carefully studied by him．See as to the $\vec{\epsilon} \theta$ vos vol．i．p． 39 and note on 1326 b 3 ．

34．vûv，＇as it is，＇without any special reference to the time at which Aristotle is writing．
 teíav oû́av $\pi \epsilon \rho_{i}$ mólıv．Bonitz（Ind． 629 b 29）groups this passage

 1059 b 16 sqq．

тои̂ тодıтıкои̂ каì тои̂ vоцо日́́тои，often mentioned in the Politics in combination：see Bon．Ind． 488 b 11，where $4(7) .4 .1326 \mathrm{a} 4$ ， 6 （4）．I． 1288 b 27 ，and 7 （5）．9． 1309 b 35 are referred to．See also Plato，Polit． 309 C．
 sense of being a whole composed of many parts．Not all com－ pounds are wholes：see Metaph．Z．I7．IO4I b II sqq．，which， following Grote（Aristotle 2．348），we may thus paraphrase－ ＇Compounds are of two sorts－aggregates like a heap（mechanical） and aggregates like a syllable（organic or formal）．In these last there are not merely the constituent elements，but something else besides．The syllable $b a$ is something more than the letters $b$ and $a$ ；flesh is something more than fire and earth，its con－ stituent elements ．．．This＂something more＂is the essence of each compound－the First Cause of existence to each．＇A whole is a compound of the second kind；in it，as in a syllable， there is over and above the constituent elements an essence which is its First Cause．＇Voce ö ōov Aristoteles fere significat id quod per certam formam definitum ac consummatum est ；cf．Metaph．I．


M. 8. 1084 b $30^{\prime}$ (Bonitz on Metaph. 4. 1. 1069 a 18). A whole is in fact a kind of $\underset{\epsilon}{\boldsymbol{\epsilon}}$ (see the passages referred to in Bon. Ind. 223 a 25 sqq.), and thus, while the $\pi$ ódss is termed a whole here and in I. 2. 1253a 20 and 4 (7).8.1328a 21 sqq., it is termed an $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu \operatorname{in~2.2.1261a~29.~It~is~implied~in~the~passage~before~us~that~}$ there are wholes which are not composed of many parts, or perhaps of parts at all. A monad, a point, and a sound ( $\phi$ 有y yos) are given in Diog. Laert. 3. 107 as instances of things which are not compound. Are these wholes? As to the method of examining the parts in order to learn the nature of the whole, see above on 1252 a I7. The parts of the $\pi \dot{\lambda} \lambda$ cs are here taken to be citizens: for other uses of the term see vol. i. pp. 98,495 , and Appendix A.

 this account of the $\pi$ ódes see vol. i. p. 226 sq., and for other accounts of it given in the Politics, vol. i. p. 283 sq. Compare with the passage before us Justin 2. 12. 14, Themistocles ... persuadet omnibus patriam municipes esse, non moenia, civitatemque non in aedificiis, sed in civibus positam.

 каì övтıva ס́́є́ калєî̀ tò̀ Гopyíav.
3. Ë́ть yáp tıs к.т. $\lambda$. For instance the ßávavoos, who was not a citizen in the full sense in the Theban oligarchy (c. 5. 1278 a 25: 8 (6). 7. I321a28) or probably in oligarchies based on birth, though he would often be so in oligarchies based simply on a property-qualification (c. 5. 1278 a 21 sqq.).
5. $\tau$ oùs $\mu$ èv oûv к.т. $\lambda$. "A $\lambda \lambda \omega s \pi \omega s$, 'in some other sense than the proper one,' opposed to кирішs or oiкєíws: cp. Eth. Eud. I. 5. 12 16a



 âגоу. По七ๆтоі $\boldsymbol{\pi} \lambda i$ itat were excluded at Athens from the archonship and from priesthoods ([Demosth.] c. Neaer. c. 92), and often did not reside within the State which made them citizens: thus Dion was a $\pi$ oin ròs $\pi$ ohír $\quad$ s of the Lacedaemonian State (Plut. Dion, cc. $1_{7}, 49$ ). See as to $\pi о \neq \eta \tau o l$ moditat Gilbert, Constitutional Antiquities of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 184 sqq.
7. oủ Tû oixcîv mou. See explanatory note on 1260 b 41. 'In the Athenian use of language a resident alien was described in contrast to a citizen, not as a demot, but as a dweller in a deme-e. g. in Corp. Inscr. Att. I. 324 we read Tev̂kpos év KvòaӨŋpaí $\omega$ oiк $\bar{\omega} \nu^{\prime}$ (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 1. $170=$ Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 177). Whether the resident
 ढ̈токкоs (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 294. 1), his designation always
 $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ छॄeivuts.
8. oưठ' oi к.т.ג., 'nor are those citizens who, [as metoeci usually do,] share in political rights to the extent of undergoing trial and suing.' It would have been more regular if Aristotle had con-


roîs àmò $\sigma \mu \mu \beta \dot{\lambda} \lambda \omega \nu$ kotr $\omega \nu 0 \hat{\sigma} \omega$, who are obviously not citizens of the State in which they possess these rights. 'A $\pi$ ' denotes the cause or origin of the association (Bon. Ind. 77 b $5^{1}$ sqq.).

 less, but for equally needless parenthetic remarks see c. II.1282 a 36 sqq. and c. 12. 1282 b 39.
 these places metoeci are still further removed from citizenship than in places in which they completely share in these rights. Mèv oivv has nothing to answer to it. It is here used in the sense of ' nay,' as in Rhet. 2. 23 . 1399 a 15,23 . ' To what exact extent the resident aliens at Athens were obliged to allow themselves to be represented by their $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \tau$ árns we have no means of saying, but it can be shown that they could plead their cause before a judicial tribunal themselves: this is proved by the speech of Demosthenes against Dionysodorus, where the speaker is a resident alien... In Herondas 2, again, the $\pi$ opvoßorkós, who pleads in person before a Coan court of justice, is obviously a $\mu$ étookos, vv, ${ }^{5} 5,40,92$ sqq.' (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 1 . $170=$ Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 177 sq.).
12. For vémew mpoatátทv, 'to take,' or 'choose,' 'a patron' (Liddell and Scott), cp. Isocr. De Pace, § 53, кaì тò̀s $\mu \dot{\iota} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau o i ́ k o u s$
 8. $35, \tau \omega ̂ \nu$ où $\nu \epsilon \mu \dot{\partial} \nu \tau \omega \nu \pi \rho о \sigma \tau a ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \mu \epsilon \tau о і ́ \kappa \omega \nu . ~$
13. Tท̂s rolaút just been described,' i.e. of the association which goes no further than a right to sue and be sued.
 sideration], just as,' etc.
 or list of citizens kept by the demarch, as to which see note on ${ }^{1} 336 \mathrm{~b} 37$. Boyhood is usually made to cease not, as here, on entry in this list, but at puberty (see note on 1333 b 3).
roùs $\gamma \in ́ p o v t a s ~ t o u ̀ s ~ a ̉ \phi \epsilon є \mu \epsilon ́ v o u s . ~ C p . ~ P l u t . ~ T i t . ~ F l a m i n i n ., ~ c . ~ 2 ~ I, ~$


 would seem that after a certain age old citizens were excused attendance at the assembly and the dicasteries, unless we take Aristotle to refer merely to their exemption from military service, as to which see Lycurg. c. Leocr. c. 40 and Diod. 14. 74. I sq. That attendance at the meetings of the assembly was to a certain extent compulsory at Athens, we see from Pollux 8. 104, though the rich seem often to have escaped attendance (6 (4). 6. 1293 a 8). Giphanius (p. 292) compares the 'senes depontani, seu de ponte deiiciendi, ut vocabant Romani,' who were excluded from the bridge which led to the Septa, the place where the comitia voted: see as to them Mommsen, Röm. Staatsrecht 3. 40I. 3, and other passages referred to by Willems, Droit Public Romain, p. 167.9 .
16. фatéov єỉval $\mu \in ́ v ~ \pi \omega s ~ \pi o \lambda i ́ \tau \alpha s, ~ o u ̉ X ~ a ́ m \lambda \omega ̂ s ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \lambda i ́ a v . ~ \Lambda i ́ a \nu ~$ qualifies $\dot{d} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ in the sense of 'very' or 'quite': cp. [Plato,]
 каì $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi i \lambda \omega \nu . \quad \Lambda i ́ a \nu$ alone (without any $\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} \varsigma$ ) stands in contrast to $\pi \omega$ s in De Part. An. 3. 7. 669 b 36 sqq.
 $\pi p o \sigma t \iota$ Ө́̀ $\nu$ tas see Jelf, Gr. Grammar, § $6 \mathrm{I}_{3}$, Obs. 5, and cp. c. 3 . 1276 b Io, 4 (7). 1. 1323 a 2 I sqq., and 1324 a 2 sq. In 4 (7). 16 .
 'The dative and the accusative of the agent are both allowed with the verbal in -réoy' (Goodwin, Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb, ed. 2, § 926).
17. àt $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon i$ ¢. Cp. c. 5. 1278 a 4, where oi $\pi a i ̂ \delta \epsilon s$ are said to be

 pliciter, et qui nullam quasi culpam in se contineat, quam oratione corrigere oporteat, ut factum est in superioribus generibus civium.' "Eyк入ך $\quad$ must here mean, not 'accusation,' but 'culpa' ('defect': Sus. ' Mangel'), for if we construe ' accusation,' the accusation will be said to 'need correction,' which is not the sense required. Bonitz (Ind. s.v.) marks off the use of ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\prime \prime} \gamma \kappa \lambda \eta \mu a$ in this passage from its ordinary use. 'Frohberger on Lys. 1o. 23 quotes Xen. Hell. 7.4.34: Lys. 16. 10: Polyb. 2. 52.4: Demosth. 1. 7 , in all which passages ${ }^{\epsilon} \gamma \kappa \lambda \lambda \mu \mu a$ seems practically to mean "offence "' (Richards).「áp, 19, probably refers not to what immediately precedes but to the general sense of the preceding passage (like $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \grave{i} \ldots \gamma \in$ in 2. $7.1267 \mathrm{a}_{12}$, where see note), and especially to the clause suppressed in $\mathrm{I}_{4}$ ('we may dismiss these from consideration'). Oi äтıцо кai $\phi u$ aióes are referred to as also being $\pi \omega s$ nodĩat, being so far citizens that their disqualification was in the case of some ät $\tau \mu$ incomplete, and in the case of all äт $\tau \mu \mathrm{m}$ and фuyádes reversible (see Schömann, Antiq. Iur. Publ. Graec. pp. 199, 234). For tìv $\dot{m} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s$



 on 1276 b 28 . As to крícews, see vol. i. p. 230 , note 1 . Kpiots here seems to mean $\dot{\eta} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \delta$ iкkai $\omega \nu$ крícıs (Plato, Laws 766 D ). A Greek hardly felt himself to be a citizen if he was excluded from

 eival). 'A $\rho \chi{ }^{\prime}$ ' is a wider term than kpíts and is made in what follows to include кpiots (e. g. in 1275 b 18 sq .).
 magistracies some are severed in point of time,' i.e. their tenure is severed, they cannot be held continuously. So Bernays, 'ein Theil der Aemter freilich erleidet zeitliche Unterbrechung.' For the con-

 катà $\chi \rho$ óvov in Metaph. м. 8. 1084 b 14 sqq. Mr. Welldon translates, 'some offices of State are determinate in point of time,' but can other passages be produced in which $\delta$ oupetio $\theta a \iota$ bears this meaning? It would be easier to explain the passage thus if we

24. ※̈at' ęvias $\mu$.èv k.t.त. Cp. 6 (4). 15. 1299 a 37 Sq. 'Evias $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ should have been followed by èvius $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, but it is in fact followed by $\eta_{,} 25$ : compare the way in which in $7(5) .6$. 1305 b $24 \dot{\eta} \mu^{\prime} \nu$
 followed by $\eta$. See also note on 1338 b r. The Lacedaemonian admiralship could not be held twice by the same person (Xen. Hell. 2. 1. 7), and the same was the case with many offices at Athens ('A $\theta$. Под. c. 62 sub fin.). At Thurii at one time a repeated tenure of the office of stratêgus by the same individual was prohibited except after an interval of five years ( $7(5) .7 \cdot 1307$ b 7 ). See on this subject Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. I. 206. I (=Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 215.4) and 2.320. I.
26. ò $\delta^{3}$ áópıatos. We expect ai $\delta$ áópıatol, but see note on 1258 b 26.
 ' not even magistrates, [to say nothing of their being magistrates unlimited in respect of time].' Philocleon in the Vespae of Aristophanes will not hear of the function of dicast not being a magistracy: see Vesp. 548-551 (Didot), 575 ,
and $6{ }^{19}$ sqq. Plato in the Laws ( 767 A : cp. 768 C ) holds that if a dicast is not in strictness a magistrate, he is in a sense a magistrate, and an important one too, on the day on which he decides a lawsuit.

 doubt commonly distinguished: Strabo, for instance (p. 665 ),
 (old Fourth) Book distinguishes between ạ̊रai and rò òккactuóv (6 (4). I4. 1297 b 4 I sqq.). When he speaks otherwise in 7 (5). 6. 1306 b 8 sq ., he is referring to oligarchical constitutions in which the judge was really a magistrate. A member of the assembly, on the other hand, would be less likely to claim to be a magistrate. In c. II. I282 a 34 Aristotle says that dicasts and members of the Boulê and the assembly are not magistrates, but parts of a magistracy.
27. Toùs toloútous, 'the above-mentioned,' i.e. dicasts and members of the assembly.
28. Sıà taût', by reason of their being dicasts and members of the assembly.
roùs kupl $\omega$ тárous. Cp. c. II. 1282 a 25 sqq . and 2. 12. 1274 a 4 sqq., and see Philocleon's description in the Vespae of the greatness of his own position as dicast. The deliberative is described as 'supreme over the constitution' in 6 (4). 14. 1299 a I and $8(6)$. r. 13 I 6 b 3 I sq. (cp. 2.6. 1264 b 33 sq.).
29. $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ỏvó $\mu a \tau 0 s \gamma \grave{a} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$., 'for the dispute is about a name, for the difficulty arises from the fact that there is no single word in use to designate that which a dicast and a member of the assembly have in common, [and to tell us] what we ought to call

 perhaps added because áv'́vvuos has much of the sense of ä $\delta \eta \lambda o s$, which is coupled with it in Metaph. z. 7. 1033 a $13, ~ \Phi \nu \delta \delta^{\circ} \dot{\eta} \sigma \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \eta \eta \sigma \iota$



 imápХєıv $\delta \in i ́ \imath$ фv́ $\sigma \epsilon \iota$ к.т. $\lambda$.
31. Sเopıซ $\mu 0 \hat{\text { u }}$ Xápıv, 'distinctionis causa' (Bon. Ind. 200 a 60, where 6 (4). 14. 1298 b I3 and Magn. Mor. 1. 34. I195 a 27 are referred to).
32. ảópıotos àpxŋ́. When an adjective and substantive are without the article, the substantive is usually in the Politics placed first and the adjective second (cp. for instance 1275 b 18 , $\mathfrak{a} p \chi \hat{\eta} s$
 סuiov, and 1277 a 33, áp $\bar{\eta} \grave{\eta} \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \kappa \kappa \dot{\eta}$ ), but now and then we find the reverse order adopted, e.g. in the passage before us and in C. II. I28I b 35, iкaข $\nu \nu$ aï $\sigma \eta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$. When under these circumstances the adjective is placed first, it is usually intended to be emphasized. Hodús and some other adjectives are exceptions to this rule; they commonly precede the substantive with which they agree (7 (5). 10. 1312 b $25: 7$ (5). 11. 1314 b 27, 30 ), and are placed after it when they are emphatic (3.16.1287b29: Plato,
 c. 162).

тoùs oüt $\mu \in \tau \in ́ X$ оуtas, those who share as ảópıotol äpXovtes, in


 סıopıf $\mu$ òs той mo入itov. We are told in fact later that the definition
of the citizen which rests on extraction fails to suit persons whom nevertheless all would hold to be citizens ( 1275 b 32 ). 'Ефарио́ттєı is a word often used by Aristotle, but it would seem to be rather a poetical than a prose word, and it does not appear to occur in Plato, Thucydides, or the Attic orators, nor indeed in Xenophon, unless the Agesilaus is his work.
 p. 242 for an interpretation of this passage. The $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \iota \tau \epsilon i a \iota$ are the iлокєíнєдa of the citizen because they are the 'res ad quas refertur' $\pi$ mírov 'notio et a quibus suspensa est' (Bon. Ind. $798 \mathrm{~b} 59, \mathrm{cp}$. 799 a 16). I follow the interpretation of Bonitz, as do also Prof. Jowett (Politics, 2. 106) and Prof. J. A. Stewart (Class. Rev. 9. 455 sq.).
35. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$ is probably a partitive genitive after ois.
36. каì тò $\mu$ è̀ аủtề к.т. $\lambda$. Cp. Eth. Nic. 1. 4. 1096 a 19-23: Eth. Eud. i. 8. 1218 a 1 sqq.: Metaph. B. 3. 999 a 6 sqq. : and see Zeller, Plato, Eng. Trans., p. 256 , note 103 (esp. p. 259).
37. ท̂ rotaûta, i.e. in the case before us 'as citizens.' The citizen of the best constitution and the citizen of an extreme democracy may have much in common with each other as animals, but little or nothing as citizens.
 groups with the passage before us Categ. 12. 14 b 4 sqq. (see Waitz on 14 a 26) and Metaph. B. 2. 997 a 12, where $\pi \rho o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a$ is conjoined


 кaì тoû $\mu$ ఢ́pous тò õ̉ov.
 used the term $\pi a \rho \epsilon \kappa \beta$ á $\sigma \epsilon$ !s (2. 11. 1273 a 3).
5. ó $\lambda_{\mathrm{X}} \boldsymbol{\theta} \boldsymbol{\theta}$ ís. Cp. 1275 a 3 2. 'He who shares in the áópıotos a $\rho \chi \eta$ of the dicast and the member of the assembly.'

 here to mean 'a people gathered in an assembly,' 'a body of ecclesiastae ' (cp. c. II. 1282 a 34 sqq., where $\delta$ є́кк $\lambda \eta \sigma a \sigma \tau \eta \eta_{s}$ is said
 the assembly.
8. $\sigma u \gamma \kappa \lambda \dot{\eta}$ rous, such as, for instance, the 5000 at Athens, whom the 400 were to call together whenever they pleased (Thuc. 8.
67.3 ). The contrast drawn implies that it was of the essence of an $\epsilon \in \kappa \lambda \lambda \sigma \sigma i a$ to meet at regular intervals, and not merely when the authorities of the State chose to convoke it. Compare the Pregadi at Venice. 'C'est le nom qu'on donnait aux sénateurs, parce que dans l'origine, alors qu'il n'existait pas de jour fixe pour leurs séances, on allait à domicile prier chaque membre de vouloir bien se rendre au Palais Ducal' (Yriarte, Vie d'un Patricien de Venise, p. 78). Schömann (Antiqq. Iuris Publ. Graec. p. 82, note 6) refers to the $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i \kappa \lambda \eta$ roo instituted by Lysimachus at Ephesus (Strabo,

 obscure. Perhaps we should compare with them the èmeiбкえnтot of 'A $\theta$. Под. c. 30.1 .21 sqq. (ed. Sandys). The members of the council of the Aetolian League were called $\dot{\text { ärók} \lambda \eta т o t ~(s e e ~ a s ~ t o ~}$ them Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 28.4). इí $\quad$ к $\lambda \eta$ rot would be officials, not ảópıбтo兀 äp $\rho$ оעtєs.

 adopts a different interpretation, ' et lites controversiasque alias alii cognoscunt ac disceptant,' and so Vict. and Bonitz ('aliam alius magistratus,' Ind. 455 b 7), but this rendering seems inconsistent
 appear to have been the plan followed at Carthage.
 ả $\lambda \lambda$ os ä $\lambda \lambda a s$. This is confirmed by Plut. Apophth. Lac. Eurycrat-
 oi eैфорои.


 ò $\eta \mu \sigma \sigma \iota \epsilon \in \nu \quad \pi \epsilon \in \rho \iota)$.
11. tòv aủtòv $\delta$ §̀ трómov к.т. $\lambda$. See note on 1273 a 19.
 definition of a citizen, as it admits of correction' (Mr. Welldon).
14. rais ä̀ $\lambda$ aus $\pi$ т $\lambda \iota \tau \in$ éass, i. e. other than democracy, as in 6. Surely, however, an assembly and dicasteries will exist in a polity? An assembly, indeed, appears to have existed in some oligarchies also, though members of it were required to possess a high property-qualification (6 (4). 9. 1294 b 3 sq.) or it was made harmless in some way ( 6 (4). 14.1298 b 26 sqq.), and not only an
assembly, but dicasteries of which the poor were at any rate nominally members (6 (4). 9. 1294 a 37 sqq.: 6 (4). 14. 1298 b 16 sqq.).
 point of time] in respect of his office,' i.e. the holder of office for


16. тоúт $\omega \nu$, i.e. $\tau \omega ิ \nu \kappa a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \grave{\varrho} \rho \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$.
rıoiv, as at Carthage, so far at least as judicial authority is concerned, for a share of deliberative authority was accorded at Carthage to the popular assembly (2.11, 1273 a 6 sqq.). In many oligarchies, probably, the power of deliberating about all matters and trying all suits was possessed by a part or the whole of the holders of office.
17. $\pi \in \rho i \tau \iota \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$. This would be characteristic of an aristocracy or a polity rather than an oligarchy (6 (4). 14. 1298 b 5 sqq.: 6 (4). 16. I30I a 13 sqq.).
 judicial office is, it would seem, enough to constitute a citizen : thus if, as in some oligarchies, e.g. that of Heracleia on the Euxine (7 (5). 6. 1305 b 34 ), the dicasteries are recruited from those outside the ruling class, the members of them would be citizens. Aristotle's view that full citizenship is constituted by access to deliberative and judicial office is quite in harmony with his description of the deliberative and judiciary of a State as 'parts of the State in an especial sense' (6 (4). 4. 1291 a 24 sqq.). In c. 5.1278 a 35, however, we are told that $\delta \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \omega \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \tau \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ -
 it would seem that a man may be a full citizen without access to ai áp $\chi^{a i}$ strictly so called, for at Malis oi $\dot{\omega} \pi \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon u k o ́ \tau \epsilon s$ were citizens, though they were not eligible for ai ajpxai (6 (4). 13. 1297b 14). Whether the mere right to elect magistrates, which is distinguished from deliberative authority in 8 (6). 4. 13 18 b 2 I sqq., would be sufficient in Aristotle's view to constitute citizenship, may be doubted. We gather from 3. 14. 1285 a 25 sqq. and 7 (5). 10. I3 II a 7 that there are citizens in States ruled by kings, but Aristotle nowhere explicitly takes account of such citizens, nor does he explain their position.
 rights': cp. c. 3.1276 a 15 and c. II. 128I b 29 sqq.


 1. 1. 1343 a 10 sq.), and this is the exacter statement.
21. ópibortaı $\delta \epsilon ̀$ к.т. $\lambda$. After giving his definition of a citizen C. 2. Aristotle now proceeds to point out the weakness of a rival definition. The citizen was commonly defined as descended from two citizen-parents. Those who defined citizenship thus could appeal to laws existing at Athens (vol. i. p. 227) and Byzantium ([Aristot.] Oecon. 2. I 346 b 26 sqq.) and to the general feeling throughout Greece, that those descended from two citizen-parents were $\gamma \nu_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma \iota o \iota$ тодîtaı (c. 5. 1278 a 30). Gilbert (Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 297. 2) traces this feeling at Oreus, Cos, Rhodes, and elsewhere. Not only citizenship but other things also were held to pass most surely by descent from both parents-e.g. virtue (Eurip. Fragm. 524,



nobility (土. 6. I255 a $3^{6}$ sqq.), and physical strength (Xen. Rep.
 रi $\boldsymbol{\gamma \nu \in \sigma \theta a \iota ) \text { . }}$
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ X $\mathrm{P} \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu$, in tacit opposition to $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \nu \bar{\omega} \tau \tau \iota \nu:$ cp. I. I I. $125^{8}$ b 9 sq.
23. oiov is here explanatory (see above on 1255 b 38 ).
oi $\delta \grave{\text { k }}$ к.т. $\lambda$., 'while others even carry this requirement further, for instance to the extent of two, three, or more ancestors.' Cp.
 үà $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda$ дov oi $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu a t o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \iota ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ả $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$. Liddell and Scott compare
 тò $\gamma$ '́vos : cp. also Menand. Inc. Fab. Fragm. 4 (Meineke, Fragm.
 connexion with sacred offices that a pedigree of this kind was required (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 32 I. I : cp. Dittenberger, Syll.Inscr. Gr., No. 371 ), but civil offices were sometimes subject to a similar restriction-thus the Thesmothetae at Athens (Aristot. Fragm. 374. I540 a 39 sqq.) and the $\tau \iota \mu 0 \hat{\chi} \chi o \iota$ at Massalia (a senate of 600 life-members which ruled the State, Strabo, p. 179) were required to be $\delta \iota a ̀ \tau \rho \iota \gamma o \nu i a s ~ \epsilon ́ \kappa ~ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \gamma є \gamma о \nu o ́ \tau \epsilon s-a n d ~ w e ~ l e a r n ~ f r o m ~$ the passage before us that some even denied the name of citizen to those who had not these advantages of descent. A still narrower
view prevailed at one time at Apollonia on the Ionian Gulf， and at Thera，where the only persons regarded as é $\lambda \in \dot{\theta} \theta \in \rho o t$ were the descendants of the original settlers（ $6(4)$ ．4．1290b 9 sqq．）． Dio Chrysostom，on the other hand，sensibly remarks（Or．4I， 2.


 spirit a slave of three generations（ $\tau$ pióovios，Soph．O．T．ro62 sq．， cp．ém $\pi$ áorovios）was thought to be especially a slave．We read of


 то入兀т兀кิ̂s єis roùs roíxous，where Schweighäuser explains＇populari， vulgari，simplici ratione，nude，sine arte，＇and［Xen．］Ages．8． 7,
 aủrov̀．＇Compare also the по入ıтıkà òvónata of Isocr．Evag．§ io＇ （Richards）．


àmopoûoí тıves tòv трítov ékeivvo ท̂̀ Tétaptov，＇some raise a ques－ tion as to that third or fourth ancestor．＇The＇third ancestor＇is apparently the great－grandfather．For this＇anticipatory accusative，＇ see Dr．Holden on Xen．Oecon．18．9，and other passages．Anti－ sthenes may have been one of these $\tau \boldsymbol{\text { tues，for }}$ ，we know that his extraction was made a subject of reproach to him，and a rejoinder of this kind would be quite in his vein（compare his rejoinder in Diog．Laert．6．4）．It is interesting to note that he was a disciple of Gorgias，of whose views we hear in 26 sqq．

26．「opyias $\mu \mathrm{èv}$ oûv к．т．$\lambda$ ．＇Gorgias of Leontini，indeed，partly perhaps in a questioning way＇（cp．àmopoû $\iota, 25$ ），＇partly in a spirit of banter，said that as those are mortars which have been made by mortar－makers，so those are Larissaeans who have been made by the handicraftsmen，for that there were certain Larissa－making handicraftsmen；but［there is nothing to raise any question about；］ the matter is simple，＇etc．T $\hat{\omega} \nu ~ \delta \eta \mu \mu o v \rho \gamma \omega ิ \nu$ must be translated＇the handicraftsmen＇and $\delta \eta \mu$ ovpyoús must be supplied after Aaptoomooós， and then the added explanation，eivat yáp тtvas＾aptroтotoús，which Ridgeway and Sus．would omit，is not otiose．The＇Larissa－ making handicraftsmen＇referred to are of course the magistrates （ $\delta \eta \mu$ нovpyoi）of Larissa，the word $\delta \eta \mu$ movpós meaning both＇handi－
craftsman' and 'magistrate.' We expect ^apıratomooovs in place of Aaptrootoov́s, and Camerarius reads Aapıratonotoús, but since a city $=$ its citizens, 'Larissa-makers' $=$ 'makers of Larissaeans,' and Aapıroтooovs, which (or rather ^apıб⿱宀тotov́s) is the reading of Г П Vat. Pal., may be used in preference to Aapıraıotoovés, partly
 a hint that the making of Larissaeans had been on so large a scale that it virtually amounted to a making of Larissa. Gorgias said that every one was a citizen who was made a citizen by the duly empowered magistrates, and thus went to the length of acknowledging all those as citizens who were made citizens by the authorities of the State, whatever the rights conferred on them; Aristotle, on the contrary, looks not merely to the persons who confer citizenship, but also to the rights conferred; if these are the rights which constitute citizenship, the persons made citizens are citizens, but not otherwise. He probably objects to Gorgias' view because according to it $\pi 0$ onvoi modita would be citizens. But Gorgias' view was in his opinion so far correct that it did not base citizenship on extraction, but traced it to the action of the State. It was quite in the spirit of Gorgias' philosophical teaching to make out that citizens and the State were manufactured, artificial products. He himself was a $\xi \in \dot{v} v o s$ at Larissa, and was no doubt not sorry to banter the Larissaean nobles on their pride of birth (compare Matt. iii. 9, 'And think not to say within yourselves, We have Abraham to our father, for I say unto you that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham'). We have seen that the word on $\eta$ ovopyós meant 'handicraftsman' as well as 'magistrate.' A line of Leonidas of Tarentum (Anth. Pal. 6. 305),

lends some colour to the view that a further équivoque lurks in the saying of Gorgias, and that Aapıraiovs may well have borne two meanings in the minds of his hearers, 'Larissaeans' and 'pots,' but as the late Dr. Thompson has pointed out (see Prof. Ridgeway, Camb. Philol. Trans. 2. 136), it is not clear that Aapıraios without a substantive could mean 'pot,' for it is linked with é $\psi \eta \tau \eta$ 'p in the epigram, and indeed, if it could, we should expect ^apıaaooooov's in the clause which follows: ^apıtбomooous, however, as has been said, is the reading of all the MSS. and of Vet. Int. The saying loses little or nothing, if this additional subtlety is withdrawn from
it. Larissa was oligarchically governed, but it is perhaps hardly likely that even there the demiurgi of the State had the uncontrolled right of admitting citizens; more probably they acted under a commission empowering them to admit to citizenship persons who fulfilled certain conditions prescribed by the State. See Szanto, Das griech. Bürgerrecht, p. 30 sq. Prof. Ridgeway (Journal of Philology, 15. p. 164) makes the not improbable suggestion that the addition to the citizen-roll of Larissa to which Gorgias' saying refers was necessitated by the blow which the city received in b. c. 404 from Lycophron of Pherae (Xen. Hell. 2.3.4). It would seem from 35 that it was not preceded by any change of constitution. Gorgias was well known for his

 $3^{1}$ that $\epsilon i \rho \omega \nu \varepsilon i ́ a ~ i m p l i e s ~ s l i g h t ~ c o n t e m p t . ~ W h e t h e r ~ M e i n e k e, ~ F r a g m . ~$ Comicorum Anonymorum, 183 (Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 649),

has anything to do with Gorgias' saying, is more thän I will undertake to decide.
32. каì yàp oúठè Suvatòv к.т. .., ${ }^{\text {, }}$ for it is not even possible [much less the fact] that the test of descent from a citizen-father or mother should apply in the case of those who were the first to dwell in the city or to found it,' and yet these would be citizens in an especial degree : compare $6(4) \cdot 4.1290 \mathrm{~b}$ I2 sq. and an inscription quoted by Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 167.3, in which a Halicar-



 'auf die ersten Ansiedler und Staatsgründer,' but $\eta^{\eta}$ appears to distinguish between being the first to dwell in a city and being the first to found it. In $7(5)$. ro. I rrob 38 , the only other passage in Aristotle's writings (except a fragment) to which the Index Aristotelicus gives a reference for the word krijeiv, k íavies is used of kings who founded cities, and I am inclined to think (with Sepulv. Vict. Lamb. and Giph.) that it is used in a similar way in the passage before us of the kticrau of cities, who, while they would no doubt be themselves among oi $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} т o t$ oikígavtes, would be marked off from them by being their chiefs and leaders. Ktikelv is especially used of these ктiotau or oikıoтai, or else of the mother-
city, though it is occasionally used of the whole body of original settlers, as for instance in Thuc. 5. 16. 3. For oủסè ôvaatóv, cp.
 I follow Bonitz (Ind. s. v.) in taking éфариóттєє here as intransitive, as in 1275 a 33, but it is quite possible that Sus., Liddell and Scott, and others are right in taking it as transitive.
34. ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda^{\lambda}$ ' ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \omega \mathrm{s}$ к.т. $\lambda .$, 'but perhaps this case lends itself more to debate, the case of those who acquired the rights of citizens after a change of constitution, such a creation of citizens, I mean, as that which Cleisthenes enacted at Athens, for he enrolled in the tribes many aliens and slave metoeci.' The question whether citizens who acquired citizenship after a change of constitution are citizens is a more difficult one than that just discussed, because the new citizens in this case are not made citizens by duly empowered magistrates of the old constitution, but by the introducer of the new one; besides, the citizens admitted by Cleisthenes were aliens and slave metoeci, and aliens and metoeci are the very opposite of citizens (c. 5. 1277 b 39). Euripides had made one of the characters of his Erechtheus say (Fragm. 362. II sqq.),



 1281 a 4 I and 3. 12. 1282 b 22. For oîov 'A $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ є̇ $\pi$ oi $\eta \sigma \epsilon \mathrm{K} \lambda \epsilon \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon$ '-
 'enacted,' 2. 12. 1274 b 7. Oīo к.т. $\lambda$. explains $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \chi о \nu$. A suggestion, however, which well deserves notice, that ou's should be added after oiov, has been recorded in the critical note on 1275 b 35 . For



 to the dethronement of the Ptolemies) in an inscription found at Philae and published in the Athenaeum for March 14, 1896. The displacement of the dynasty is expressed by the plural, as in 'pulsis regibus,' Tac. Hist. 3. 72. This is the sense which
the plural seems to bear in the passage before us, though oi túpavvo is often loosely used where an act of only one of the tyrants is referred to (e.g. in 'AӨ. Под. с. 19.1. 13 and c. 20. 1. 2, and in Demosth. c. Mid. c. 144). 'Ефиえétevoe is stronger than mo入íras द̇той́rato would have been. As to סoúdous $\mu$ етоікоиs see vol. i. p. 231 note. Cp. also [Plato,] Alcib. I. 119 A, à $\lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ t $\uparrow \hat{\nu}$ ä̉ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$

 $\xi \in v o c$ include slaves, and Hecataeus, Fragm. 318 (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 1. 24). Bernays (Heraklit. Briefe, p. 155) takes $\xi^{\prime}$ éous and doúdous as both of them adjectives and $\mu$ eroíkovs as the substantive common to them, referring to Aristoph. Eq. 347 Didot,

which shows that the term $\xi$ $\xi$ '́vos $\mu$ érookos was a recognized one, but on the other hand $\xi \in \notin \nu o u$ and $\mu$ étooko are often distinguished (e.g. in c. 5. 1277 b 39), and perhaps it is hardly likely that Cleisthenes confined himself to enfranchising resident aliens. His object was to strengthen his own party among the citizens, the democratic party, and this was most effectually done by enrolling aliens and slave metoeci, for they were sure to side with him against the
 which he sought to strike a blow (8 (6).4. 1319 b 26). Towards the close of the Peloponnesian War Athens enrolled not only metoeci but aliens also as citizens (Diod. 13.97. 1). Not all aliens were absolute aliens; some were sons of a citizen-father by a mother not of citizen-birth, like the $\xi$ 'evor mentioned in c. 5.1278 a 26 sqq. Those aliens and metoeci who had a touch of servile blood in their veins would be most unwelcome as citizens, for we learn in c. 5 . 1278 a 33 that citizens of servile origin were the first to be extruded when the State could afford to get rid of them. How hateful the measure of Cleisthenes must have been to many, we see from




 éceuvivéro. The 'happy city' of Lucian's Hermotimus, in which
 contrast to the generally accepted ideal. The making of slaves and aliens citizens was a measure often resorted to by tyrants (see
vol. i. p. 547 , note 2 : Diod. II. $7^{2}$. 3, 14. 7. 4) and by extreme democrats (Xen. Hell. 2. 3. 48).


1. âp' $\epsilon i \mu \eta\rangle$ סıкaíms mo久itns, oủ mo久írns, 'whether, if a man is not 1276 a . justly a citizen, he is not in fact no citizen at all.' This Aristotle will not admit : compare the line he takes in Eth. Nic. 3. 6. 1113 a ${ }_{17}$ sqq. Cicero, on the contrary, in De Legibus 2.5. 11-2.6. 14 denies that faulty laws are laws at all.
 $\tau \epsilon$ in sentences of this kind cp. c. 4 . 1277 a 20 sq . and 4 (7). 10 .

 каї |  | $\omega \rho \gamma \omega ิ \nu$. |
| :---: | :---: |



C. 3 . The question whether these citizens are justly citizens or not is connected with the question whether they were made citizens by the State or not, a question which some identify with the question whether the constitution under which they have become citizens is based merely on force or exists for the common advantage, and if we deny that the acts of a tyrant or an oligarchy are acts of the State on the ground that the tyranny or oligarchy is based merely on force and does not exist for the common good, we must say the same thing of the acts of any democracy which is in the same position, so that we shall deny that those who are created citizens by a democracy of this kind are justly citizens. Aristotle appears to hint that the democracy introduced by Cleisthenes was a democracy resting on force and not for the common good, and that on the principle laid down by the persons to whom he refers the aliens whom Cleisthenes made citizens were not justly citizens, but he does not adopt the view that the acts of a constitution not for the common good are not acts of the State.
10. то́тє Yàp к.т...., 'for then some are not willing to discharge either (public) contracts on the plea that the tyrant, not the State, received the loan, or many other obligations of a similar kind, holding that some constitutions are based on superior force and are not for the common advantage, [and that the acts done by the authorities they constitute are consequently not acts of the State].' These persons probably regarded democracies as in an especial degree constitutions for the common advantage : compare Demosth. c. Timocr. c. 76 , where it is argued that democracies, unlike
oligarchies, are governed by laws conceived in the interest of the citizens. Our own use of the words 'republic' and 'commonwealth' indicates the prevalence of a cognate view (see Sir J. R. Seeley, Introduction to Political Science, p. 173). For an instance in which a public contract ran a risk of being thus repudiated, see
 quashing of acts and judicial decisions ; this happened after the fall of the Thirty at Athens (Aeschin. c. Timarch. c. 39 : Demosth. c. Timocr. c. 56: Andoc. De Myst. c. 87). Questions of a similar nature have found their way into modern English law-courts. 'Given a revolutionary government which has been recognized by foreign States as a government de facto, but which has since been superseded by a more legitimate régime, are its acts and contracts to be held valid or not by the courts of those foreign States, as far as concerns the subjects over which they have jurisdiction? This was the issue which Mr. Justice Kay had to decide yesterday in the case of "The Republic of Peru v. Dreyfus"' (Times, Feb. 2 1, 1888, where a report of the case will be found). This case, it will be noticed, applies only to revolutionary governments recognized by foreign States.
12. т@̣̂ кратєîv oữas. Cp. De Gen. An. x. I8. 723 a 3 I, єỉ тои̂то
 as фúvєє єivaı or tàs ßía $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon s(P l a t o, ~ P o l i t . ~ 280 ~ D) . ~$.







סдоíws к.т. $\lambda$., ' we must say that the acts of the authorities set up by this constitution are to just the same extent and no more acts of this State as those proceeding from the oligarchy and the tyranny.'




 Scott s.v. ̇̇k iii. 3, and see note on I302 a 4. Cp. also 7 (5). 10. 13IOb 6 , тàs á $\mu a \rho \tau i a s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi a \rho ’ ~ a ̉ \mu \phi o \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \pi o \lambda เ \tau \epsilon \epsilon \omega ิ \nu$, and Demosth.

 к.т.ג., 'but the inquiry [to which we have just referred] seems to be cognate to this question, on what principle we ought to say that,' etc. With Sepulveda, Bernays, and Welldon I take $\pi \hat{\omega} s$
 Looking to $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ àmopias, $\mathbf{1} 9$, this seems to be the more natural inter-
 àmopoîol, 8. Aristotle means that the question whether the contracts of those who are in power under a constitution resting on force and not for the common advantage are acts of the State and should be fulfilled by those who are in power after a change of constitution is cognate to the question under what circumstances the State is to be regarded as the same or not the same. He decides ( 1276 b io sqq.) that after any change of constitution the State is not the same, but that the question as to the fulfilment of contracts is a separate one. As to $\pi \hat{\omega} s \pi o \tau \epsilon$, see Liddell and Scott, who refer to Soph. O. T. 1210 .

19 sqq. 'The mode of dealing with this problem which lies nearest to hand is in connexion with the site and its inhabitants, for the site and the inhabitants may be divided into two or more sections, and some of the inhabitants may dwell on one site, and some on another.' Mèv oủv is taken up by $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ o ồv, 22, but it is difficult to say where the answering particle is to be found. For


 кai тoùs àv $v \rho \dot{\rho} \pi$ тous have been interpreted in two ways. Vict. explains them, 'contingit enim ut locus distinctus sit, hominesque eodem pacto separati, ita ut hi hanc, alii vero aliam sedem habeant.' Mr. Welldon, on the other hand, translates, 'it is possible that the inhabitants should be divorced from the site and should come to dwell in different sites.' Perhaps the former interpretation is to be preferred. As an instance of some inhabitants dwelling on one site and others on another, we may take the $\delta$ ooiktors of Mantineia by the


 will a change of this kind have destroyed the identity of the $\pi \dot{\delta}$ ass? Aristotle's somewhat curt answer is that the word $\pi$ ôtcs is used in many different senses, and that it is easy to solve the question if
that is borne in mind. His meaning perhaps is that if we take tólıs in the sense of 'an aggregate of human beings or citizens,' the Mantineans after the סוoikıots will still constitute the same State as before, but if we take it in the sense of 'an aggregate of human beings or citizens gathered on a given site,' they will no longer do so.
24. óroíws $\delta \frac{\epsilon}{\epsilon}$ к. т. $\lambda_{\text {., ' 'and similarly [one might raise the question] }}$ in the case also in which the inhabitants occupy one and the same site, when we ought to consider the módis to be one.' Are we to say that it is one, however large the site may be and however varied in race the inhabitants, provided only that it is enclosed within one and the same wall?
26. oủ $\gamma \mathrm{d} \rho$ S $\grave{\eta}$ тois $\tau \epsilon$ íx $\epsilon \sigma เ \nu$, 'for surely it is not one $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$ in virtue of its walls.' For $\gamma$ àp $\delta \dot{\eta}$, cp. c. 9. 1280 b 24 and 4 (7). 4.1326 a 32.
 probably remembers a famous taunt of the Athenians addressed to the Lacedaemonians, which is recorded in the Funeral Oration ascribed to Lysias, c. 44, v̌ vтє 'I $\sigma \theta \mu o ́ \nu . .$. ỏ $\rho \gamma \iota \sigma \theta \epsilon ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ 'A $\begin{aligned} & \eta \nu a i o \iota ~ \sigma v \nu \epsilon \beta o u ́ \lambda \epsilon v o \nu ~ a v ̉ \tau o i ̂ s, ~ \epsilon i ̉ ~ \tau a v ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \\ & \nu \\ & \omega\end{aligned} \mu \eta \nu$
 Temenidae of Euripides (Fragm. 730) ran,

Polybius (2.37.9 sqq.) implies that in his day Peloponnesus was virtually one city, having the same magistrates, etc., the only want being a common wall.

тolaútך, 'like Peloponnesus with a wall round it.' Cp. 4 (7). 4 . 1326 b 3 sqq.
28. кai Baßu入̀̀v. . . 30. mó $\lambda \epsilon \omega$. As to Babylon, see note on 1326 b 3. The walls of Babylon according to Herodotus (r. 178) were 480 stadia in circumference, according to Ctesias (Diod. 2. 7) 360 stadia, and according to Cleitarchus (Diod. ibid.) 365 stadia. A still larger circuit of wall ( 1500 stadia) was to be found after Aristotle's time at Antiochia Margiana (the modern Merv), if we could trust Strabo (p. 516). Herodotus (r. 191) says that owing to the size of Babylon, when the outer part of it had been taken, the inhabitants of the centre were unaware of the fact and continued to celebrate a festival till they learnt it; he does not mention that the interval amounted to three days. Here, as in 2.3. 1262 a 18 sqq., 3. 13. 1284a 26 sqq., and 4 (7). 2. 1324b I7 sq. (see notes on these passages), Aristotle mentions a circumstance also mentioned
by Herodotus，but mentions it with a slight variation．He may possibly quote Herodotus from memory．Megalopolis was taken by Cleomenes＇before the Megalopolitans were aware of the fact＇ （Plut．Cleom．c．23），but then Megalopolis was＇a great desert＇ （Polyb．2． $55 \cdot 2: 5 \cdot 93.5$ ）．For the omission of $\pi \dot{o} \hat{\lambda}$ es after $\pi a ̂ \sigma a$ see note on 1266 b I；its omission is facilitated by the occurrence of the word $\pi$ ò̀cos in the next line．For the interposition of кai $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \ldots \pi \lambda^{2} \epsilon \omega s$ between $\hat{\eta} s$ and its antecedent Baßu入 $\bar{\nu} \nu$ ，cp．Phys．

 $\mu$ évoo rodírov is interposed in a somewhat similar way in Pol．3．4．




 oi тounpoì єìs rà đovnpá．

 probably suggested by the mention of Peloponnesus，of which
 this question see vol．i．p． 295 ，note I，where it has been pointed out that it is not dealt with in $4(7) \cdot 4$ ，though the proper size of the
 $125^{2} \mathrm{~b} 27$ ），and a question might naturally be raised whether it should not also consist of more $\epsilon \theta \nu \eta$ than one．The colony of Thurii had been recruited from a variety of sources（Diod． 12. 10．4：12．11．3），and Plato had seen advantages in a citizen－body derived from more quarters than one（Laws 708）．

34．ả̀入̀̀ к．т．入．With the discussion of the question of the identity of the $\pi$ óncs which commences here should be compared the remarks of Plutarch on the same subject in De Sera Numinis Vindicta，c． 15 ：Plutarch，however，does not seem to have had this passage of the Politics before him．The question of identity had long been raised in reference to the individual．The speculations of Heraclitus and his doctrine of the flux of all things had drawn attention to this question，and Epicharmus had made a character in one of his comedies point to the increase and decrease in size which takes place in human beings and ask how this increase and
decrease was compatible with personal identity，and how a man whose identity had changed could be called on to pay his debts． See Diog．Laert．3．ro－if，and Bernays＇essay on＇Epicharmos und der àjgavó $\mu$ evos $\lambda$ dóyos＇in his Gesammelte Abhandlungen x．ro9－ 117，and Zeller，Gr．Ph．1．461．I．Compare also the remarks of Diotima in Plato，Symp． 207 D．Aristotle is concerned in the passage before us not with the question of the identity of the individual，but with the question of the identity of the $\pi$ oits．In dealing with this question as with others，he steers a midway course．He agrees neither with Isocrates，who held that States are immortal（De Pace § 120 ），nor with those who held that change in the individuals composing them destroyed their identity ；their identity is according to him destructible，but it is destroyed by a change of constitution，not by a change of individuals．

37．$̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ каì $\pi о т \alpha \mu о$ о̀s к．т．入．Heraclitus had denied that they


 Aristotle holds that the constant change of the watery particles of which a river is composed does not prevent its remaining the same．A river，however，is different from a móds．It is not an
 of which depends on the arrangement of the parts（Metaph．$\Delta .26$ ．

 remain the same so long as its particles consist of water，but a mónts will not remain the same，so long as it consists of men of the same stock，if meanwhile a change should occur in its

 катокои́ขтшу．

Tク̀v $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ đóhıv érépav，＇but the State different［if there is a change of polity］＇（Mr．Welldon，following Bernays）．
 stitution．＇Bekker places a comma after $\pi$ oh̀七 $\bar{\omega} \nu$ ，but I follow

 the $\pi \sigma^{2} \iota \iota$ ，is said to be a kolvavia（see note on 1276 b 28 ）．
 a mere tautology，like those collected by Vahlen in his note on

Poet. I. 1447a 17, but perhaps it is more likely that סua申epovaŋs refers to changes less complete than a change of kind.

 identity : compare the passages from the Topics which Bonitz (Ind. 729 a 5 I sq.) groups with the passage before us-Top. 6. 13. I50 b





 оíтшoi $\delta^{\circ}$ ỏcroùv. For the notion that a change of laws might affect the identity of a mólıs, compare Plato Com., Fragm. 42 (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 692). According to Plut. De Ser. Num. Vind. c. 15 the identity of the $\pi$ ó̀ıs remains $\mu$ é $\chi \rho \iota s$ ầ $\dot{\eta}$ поoovora каì

4. $ั \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \gamma є ~ к а i ̀ ~ \chi o \rho o ̀ v ~ к . т . \lambda ., ~ ' a s ~ w e ~ s a y ~ t h a t ~ a ~ c h o r u s ~ a l s o ~$ appearing at one time as a comic, and at another as a tragic, chorus is not the same.' 'The tragic chorus consisted of three files ( $\sigma$ roî 0 ) of five men each and of five ranks ( $\check{v \gamma a ́}$ ) of three men each; the comic chorus of four files of six men each and of six ranks of four men each' (C. F. Hermann, Gr. Ant. 3. 2. 205, A. Müller, Die gr. Bühnenalt., where Pollux 4. 108-9 is referred to). Thus the $\epsilon i \delta 0$ os $\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \sigma v v \theta \epsilon \in \sigma \omega s$ was different in the case of a tragic and comic chorus. The numbers of the two kinds of chorus were also different, and, as Mr. Richards points out, it is remarkable that Aristotle takes no notice of this. He implies that in a Dorian and a Phrygian 'harmony' the sounds may be the same, but that even
 quite clear what this means. Does it mean that the sounds will be arranged in a different order? It is still less easy to say how a political constitution is an $\epsilon i \hat{i} 0 s \tau \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma v \nu \theta^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega s$ of the elements of the móds. Does Aristotle mean that in each constitution the citizens of a $\pi \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{o}_{\iota}$ s are arranged in a different way-that in an aristocracy the best men are at the head and in an oligarchy or democracy the rich or the poor? Perhaps so: compare 6 (4). 4. 1290 b 25 sqq. and 4 (7). 2. 1324 a 17, in the latter of which passages he appears to imply that a constitution is a diá $\theta \sigma \sigma$ s $\pi \stackrel{\lambda}{\epsilon \omega}$.






6. $\pi a ̂ \sigma \alpha \nu ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu ~ к о \iota \nu \omega \nu i ́ a \nu ~ к \alpha i ̀ ~ \sigma u ́ v \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu . ~ \sum \dot{v} \nu \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ is the wider term. For $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu ~ к о \iota \nu \omega \nu i a \nu, ~ c p . ~ 4 ~(7) . ~ 2 . ~ 1325 ~ а ~ 8, ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~$ yє́vos ${ }^{2} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \omega \pi \omega \nu$ каì $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu ~ a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu ~ к о \iota \nu \omega \nu i a \nu . ~$
 as with $\delta$ aùrós (see above on 5 ), the subject of the sentence often is without the article: cp. c. 4.1277 b $13,17,24,30$ sq., and c. 6. 1278 bI 3 sq .
9. $\lambda$ é $\gamma о \mu \epsilon \nu$. See below on 1277 a 37.


 ever Freeman, Sicily 2. 115 and 486 sqq.), Zancle received the name Messana from Anaxilas of Rhegium when he expelled the Samians and peopled the city afresh. On the other hand, Catana retained its name, when Dionysius the Elder replaced its citizens by Campanians (Diod. 14. 15), and so did the Trachinian Heracleia, though its inhabitants were changed by the Thebans in B.c. 395 (Diod. 14. 82. 6, 7). The name of Corinth was replaced by that of Argos in B. с. 393 during the supremacy of a faction, though the inhabitants were unchanged (Xen. Hell. 4. 4. 6, ópêvtes סè roùs


C. 4. 16 sqq. Aristotle passes on from defining the citizen to examine the nature of his virtue, just as after defining the slave he goes on in 1. I3. 1259 b 2 I sqq. to ask what is the virtue of the slave. He has there found that the virtue of the woman, child, and slave is not $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon$ eia $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$, but relative to the head of the household, and now he asks in effect whether the virtue of the citizen is $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i a$ aipє $\tau^{\prime}$, and whether it is identical with the virtue of the good man. Thucydides (2. 42. 2-4) makes Pericles argue in his Funeral Oration that those who had fallen gloriously fighting for their country were eo ipso proved to be good men, for their service to the State outweighed and cast into the shade all private faults. It is not, however, so much in correction of views of this kind
as in correction of the teaching of Socrates that the Fourth Chapter is written. Socrates had taught the unity of virtue, claiming that virtue is one and the same in all who possess it. Aristotle holds, on the contrary, that virtue varies with the work a person has to do, and that, as a citizen's work is relative to the constitution, his virtue varies with the constitution. To identify the virtue of the good citizen with that of the good man is therefore to ignore the difference between one constitution and another. It is also to ignore the difference between the ruling and ruled citizen in the best of constitutions. See vol. i. p. 234 sqq. as to the contents of the Fourth Chapter. Looking to the definition of a citizen which Aristotle has already given, we might expect him to say that the virtue of a citizen consists in the ability to deliberate and judge well, i.e. to rule well. But we learn in the Fourth Chapter that the work of a citizen consists not only in ruling but also in being ruled, and therefore that his virtue consists in knowing not only how to rule but also how to be ruled, with this limitation, however, that the only kind of rule which he needs to know is that which is exercised over freemen. To learn this he must be ruled first and rule afterwards-a principle which is not forgotten when Aristotle comes to construct his 'best State' (4 (7). 14. I 333 a in sqq.). One remarkable conclusion, it should be noted, results from the Fourth Chapter. This is that the good man cannot be a good citizen (in the sense of contributing to the preservation of the constitution) in any constitution but the best without ceasing to be a good man in the strict sense of the words. The justice of Socrates, for instance, is not the imperfect kind of justice which tends to the preservation of a democracy (7 (5).9. 1309 a 36 sqq .). But is Aristotle's account of good citizenship correct? Is not he a good citizen whose influence tends to the improvement of a constitution rather than he whose influence tends to its preservation? May not a man be all the better as a citizen because he is morally and intellectually somewhat in advance of the constitution under which he lives? Is a good citizen bound to do what contributes to the preservation of that constitution, even if it is a tyranny or an extreme democracy or oligarchy? See note on I337 a 27.
18. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta \eta_{\nu} \ldots \gamma \epsilon$, 'but certainly': see above on 127 I a 20.
19. For тúmę тví, 'in some sort of outline,' cp. Plato, Phileb. 6i A,

and Laws 718 C and 802 D sq., and for $\tau \dot{u} \pi \omega$ т $\tau v i ̀ \lambda \eta \pi \tau \epsilon \in \nu$, Aristot.


21. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \lambda \omega \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \rho \omega \nu$ is in strictness in the gen. after $\epsilon$ ध́ácтov, 24.
22. ó $\mu$.̀̀ $\gamma$ àp к.т. ג. For the relative rank of these personages cp. Aristoph. Eq. 54 I Didot,




a passage already referred to by Camerarius (Interp. p. I14). As to the $\kappa \nu \beta \epsilon \rho \nu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta s$, cp. c. 6. 1279 a 3.
 veda's note on 'perfectissima cuiusque ratio,' p. 77 b), 'it is clear that the most exact definition of the virtue of each will be special to the man.' As to $\lambda$ óros, 'definition,' see Bon. Ind. 434 b 6 sqq., where it is pointed out that $\lambda$ óros is sometimes used in a wider sense than óptoruós, and as to the contrast of ì̀oos and kotvòs $\lambda$ óyos, see Bon. Ind. 339 a 55 and vol. i. p. 242 note.


 $\delta \epsilon$, ' but equally.'





 12. 25.5.

 association' seems hardly to answer to 'the safeguarding of the voyage'; we expect rather 'the safeguarding of the successful working of the State'; and though the $\pi$ ò兀тккі) коицши'a is often, as here, identified with the $\pi$ тлı兀eia (compare for instance 2. 1. 1260 b ${ }_{27} 7$ and 6 (4). 11. 1295 b 35), the $\pi \operatorname{on}_{\text {ts }}$ is more usually said to be the кouvovía (e.g. in c. 3.1276 b 1). For the structure of the sentence, in which (with Stahr, Bern., Sus., and others) I take кowvvia to be the subject and $\dot{\eta}$ modereia the predicate, cp. с. 6.1278 b io,
 то入เтєia：c．7．1279a 25 sqq．：and c．13．1283 b 41 ，$\pi \rho$ о̀s тò коועò̀ тò $\tau \omega ิ \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \hat{\nu^{*}} \pi 0 \lambda i \tau \eta s$ ס̀̀ к．т．$\lambda$ ．See also note on 1275 a 22.
 $\tau \eta े \nu ~ a ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa a \theta^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \nu \sigma \pi o v \delta a i o s ~ a ̉ \nu \eta \rho^{\prime} \rho$ ．Compare the line of an unknown elegiac poet quoted in Eth．Nic．2．5． 1106 b 34，
and Eth．Eud．7．2． 1237 a $30, \delta$ ס̀̀ $\sigma \pi o v \delta a i o s ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon o s: ~ a l s o ~ P o l . ~ 6 ~(4) . ~$.

 riav．Te入єia ả $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ in the passage before us probably means aj $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ $\mu \eta$ ग $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ i \pi \pi o ́ \theta \epsilon \sigma i \nu \tau \iota \nu a$ ．It turns out，indeed，on further investigation （ 1277 b 18 sqq ．），that the virtue of the good man is not strictly one， but has two forms，the virtue of the ruler and the virtue of the ruled．As to фa $\mu \dot{\prime} \nu$ ，see below on 1277 a 14.

34．$\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oûv is answered by ov̉ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda a ́, 36$ ，as in 5 （8）．6．I34 I b 4 sqq．（Sus．${ }^{1}$ Ind．Gramm．s．v．Mév），and also in 6 （4）．7．1293 b I sqq．

36．oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ к．т．$\lambda_{\text {．，＇＇not but that it is possible in another }}$ way also to go over the same argument in reference to the best constitution by raising questions and debating them．＇＇In another way，＇because hitherto the best constitution has not been made the subject of the inquiry．For $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \lambda \theta \epsilon i \nu$ rò̀ aù $\partial \grave{\nu} \nu \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu, \mathrm{cp}$ ．Phys．

 tamen etiam alio modo eandem rationem pertractare et persequi licet de optima reipublicae administrandae forma dubitantibus＇：
 （as do apparently Stahr and Bernays），but not，I think，rightly． $\Delta ı a \pi o \rho o \hat{v} \tau \tau a s$（here $=\delta \iota є \rho \chi o \mu$ évous tàs àmopías，Bon．Ind． 187 b II）is added to indicate to us the mode of investigation which Aristotle is about to adopt．That Aristotle＇goes over the same argument＇ we shall see if we bear in mind that he has just shown that the good citizen will not necessarily be a good man under any and every constitution，and now goes on to show that this is true of
 10 and 2．8． 1269 a 13，and（with Bonitz，Ind． 772 b 19）Meteor． 1． $3 \cdot 340 \mathrm{a} 15$ ．

37．$\epsilon \mathfrak{i}$ ү⿳亠口冋阝 к．т．$\lambda_{\text {．，＇for }}$ if it is impossible that a State should consist of members all of whom are good，and yet each member
must discharge his function well，and this proceeds from virtue，［so that，though all will not be good，all will possess virtue，i．e．the virtue of the citizen，］still，as it is impossible that all the citizens should be alike，there would not be one form of virtue belonging to the good citizen and to the good man；for the virtue of the good citizen ought to belong to all（for it is necessarily only in that way that the State will come to be the best State），but the virtue of the good man cannot possibly belong to all，unless all the citizens in the good State must necessarily be good，［which we have declared to be impossible］．＇It is implied that the citizens will not be alike if they all possess the virtue of a citizen，but that they will，if they possess in addition the virtue of a good man．The virtue of the good man is one，whereas the virtue of the good citizen varies with the function discharged．Compare 2．2．1261 a 24 ，oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ үivetaı mó̉ıs $\epsilon \in \xi$ ónoi $\omega \nu$ ，a doctrine which may also be traced in 3 ．I2． 1283 a 18 sq．and 3．Ir．128 I b 34 sqq．，and indeed in Fragm． 2 I of the Aeolus of Euripides，

$\lambda a o ̀ s ~ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon$ v́otтo $\pi \lambda$ доvбí $\omega \nu$ ä äтєp；


where Euripides perhaps has before him Heraclitus＇doctrine of the harmony of contraries．But is it Aristotle＇s view that the citizens of the＇best State＇cannot all be good men？This does not seem to be his view in $4(7) \cdot x 3.133^{2}$ a $3^{2}$ sqq．，where we are told that all the citizens of the＇best State＇will be good men（compare 7 （5）． 12.1316 b 9 ，where it appears to be implied that there may be States in which all the citizens are good men）．Either we must admit a discrepancy between the passage before us and these passages and leave it unexplained，or we may seek to explain it by saying（with Zeller，Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics，Eng． Trans．，vol．ii．p．209，note 2 ：see my first volume，p．236，note 2）that the passage before us is merely aporetic，or by supposing that the word＇citizen＇is used in the passage before us（as seems sometimes to be the case，see vol．i．Appendix B）in a wider sense than in $4(7)$ ． 13． $133^{2}$ a $3^{2}$ sqq．

39．$\alpha^{3} \pi^{3} \dot{\alpha} \rho \in \tau \hat{\jmath}$ ，cp． 4 （7）．13．1332 a 12 and Eth．Nic．2．5． 1106 a 22 sqq．
1277 a ．5．ヒ̈т兀 к．т．入．This is a further thrust．In $1276 \mathrm{~b} 37-1277$ a 5 it has been argued that though all the citizens of the best State will
be good citizens, they will not all be good men, but now it is argued that they will not all be good citizens in the same way -one will be a good citizen in the way in which a ruler is a good citizen, and another a good citizen in the way in which a ruled person is a good citizen-and thus the virtue of all the citizens will not be the same, so that if the various forms of the virtue of the citizen are not identical with each other, they cannot all be identical with the virtue of the good man. This argument leads directly up to what follows in 1277 a 12 sqq., and I cannot agree with Susemihl that it ought to be bracketed as an interpolation. I did not see the relation in which 1277 a $5-12$ stands to 1276 b $37-1277$ a 5 so clearly when I wrote vol. i. p. 236 as I do now. See also Prof. J. A. Stewart's remarks in defence of the genuineness of $1277^{\text {a }}$ 5-12 in Class. Rev. 9. 456.
 I do not feel sure that he is wrong. If we retain the word, Aristotle's meaning will apparently be that ownership of property consists of master and slave, or in other words implies the existence of an owner and a slave. Surely, however, ownership implies the existence of things owned as well as of persons owned?
9. ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ àvouoi $\omega v$ єi $\delta \hat{\sigma} \nu$, such as ruling and ruled citizens, and soldiers in contrast with deliberators and judges.
 tragic chorus marched into the theatre in its five ranks and three files (see above on 1276 b 4), its left-hand file was turned to the audience and its right-hand file to the stage ; the left-hand file was consequently the most conspicuous of the three files. The kopuфaios was third in this file, the two maparátal second and fourth, and the two roıtootárat (Metaph. $\Delta$. ir. 1018b 27) first and fifth. See on this subject C. F. Hermann, Gr. Ant. 3.2.206 sq. (A. Müller, Die gr. Bühnenalt.). For the absence of the article before кориф́aiov see note on 1285 b 12 .
 каi à àdoòs $\sigma \pi$ ovōaiov, for here the question raised in 1276 b 17 receives an answer.
 good citizen and the good man be the same in a particular citizen?' By rıvós is evidently meant äpरovtos, cp. 20 sqq. For the absence of the article before à $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$, see note on $127^{6} \mathrm{~b} 5$.

good and prudent, and the man who is capable of ruling a State ( r 278 b 3 sqq.) must necessarily be prudent.' To be àyatós is not

 without being àratós (Eth. Nic. 6. 13. I144 a 36), or indeed really

 seems to be used by Aristotle when he recalls some well-known principle of his philosophy (as in I. 2. 1253 a 9, oùòèv yáp, ©́s фauév, $\mu \dot{\pi} \eta \eta \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta}$ ф́vts $\pi о \epsilon \epsilon i ̂)$, or repeats what he has already said in the same treatise (as in 3.18. 1288 a $3^{2}$ ) or in another (as in 4 (7). 13.
 generàlly accepted view. Фан́́ $\nu$ may here possibly refer to I. I3.
 $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{c}$ фpovij $\sigma \omega$ s, see note on this passage), where the head of a household is referred to, but the view was a commonly accepted
 where the rule is applied to generals of cavalry : Plato, Rep. 433 C : Isocr. De Antid. § $7 \mathrm{I}:$ Xen. Cyrop. 1. 6. 22). If every ruler needs to be фpóvuos, the ruler of a State does so especially; indeed we are told in Eth. Nic.6.8.114I b 23 that ròı兀тќ́ and фpóvputs are the same habit. Cp. Plut. De Pyth. Orac. c. 22, à àג̀̀ кaì tòv Bátrov


 tion of a ruler some make out to be different (from that of a ruled person),' i. e. not only his virtue, but the training by which it is imparted; or possibly not only the virtue of the fully-developed ruler, but his very education, which begins in childhood and is the first step in his development. Aristotle quite agrees that if the rulers are to be throughout life different from the ruled, their education will be different ( 4 (7). 14. $133^{2}$ b 12 sqq.), but the rulers of his best State, unless it takes the form of an Absolute Kingship, will be ruled first and rulers afterwards ( 1332 b 25 sqq.).
 of kings are taught riding and the art of war.' For кaì фaivovaa, see note on 1262 a 18 . Compare Plut. De Adul. et Amic. c. 16 ,





 The sons of the great at Athens were trained in riding (Isocr. Areopag. § 45 : Plato, Meno 93 D, 94 B), but not Greek boys in general, as would seem from the passage before us and from 5 (8). 3. I 337 b 23 sqq. ; Persian boys, on the contrary, were taught to ride, to shoot with the bow, and to speak the truth (Hdt. I. 136).
19. каi Eủpıríŋŋs ф $\eta \sigma i$ к.т. $\lambda$. Occasionally (here for instance and in I. I3. I260a 29), but not always (see 土. 6. I255 a 36), Aristotle ascribes to the dramatic poet himself a saying placed by him in the mouth of one of his characters. The fragment before us is from the Aeolus and is preserved in a completer form by Stobaeus, Floril. 45. I3 (Eurip. Fragm. 16 Nauck),

$\mu \dot{\eta} \mu о \iota ~ \tau a ̀ ~ к о \mu \psi a ̀ ~ \pi о \iota к i ́ \lambda о \iota ~ \gamma \in \nu o i ́ a \tau о, ~$

The lines are no doubt spoken by King Aeolus and relate to the princes his sons. Thus they are quite to the point. In $\tau \dot{a}$ ко $\psi \psi \dot{a}$ Euripides probably has in view the varied subtleties which had been introduced into Greek education in the days which followed the repulse of the Persian invasion (5 (8). 6. 1341 a 28 sqq.), whether connected with musical art or with such subjects as geometry and astronomy (for in Xen. Mem. 4. 7 Socrates thinks it necessary to prescribe limits to these studies) and dialectic and philosophy. See note on 1337 a 39. Mr. Richards compares Thuc. 1. 84. 5,

 is thinking partly of prowess in arms, cp. Probl. 27. 5. 948 a 31 sqq. : Eurip. Suppl. 855 Bothe, 881 Dindorf,





 $\pi о ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \pi a \rho a \sigma \chi \epsilon i \nu \quad \sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \quad \chi \rho \dot{\rho} \sigma \iota \mu \circ \nu$ $\theta \epsilon \lambda \omega \nu$,
Eurip. Fragm. 284. 16 sqq., 362. 25 sqq., and a fragment of the Phaedo or Phaedrias of Alexis (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 497),



 referred to. But Euripides probably has especially before him the teaching of Protagoras of Abdera, who claims in Plato, Protag. 318 D sqq. that he does not, like Hippias of Elis, carry boys back to the arts from which they have just escaped and make them study calculation, astronomy, geometry, and music, but teaches

 $\lambda_{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu . \quad$ Cp. Gorg. 49 I A sq., where Callicles expresses similar views.
 ả $\rho \in \tau \dot{\eta}$, not $\dot{\eta}$ à $\rho \epsilon \tau \eta$, see note on 1276 b 5 .
23. tıòs $\mu$ évтol mo入ítou. See note on 1276 a 28.
 a citizen is different from that of a ruler, a citizen having, at any rate occasionally, to become a private man, a part which Jason did not know how to play. The first question which arises as to this saying of Jason's is as to the meaning of öтє $\mu \eta$ here. ${ }^{~} 0 \tau \tau \mu \eta$ is used with the optative in Hom. Il. 13.319 and 14.247 sq., etc. and Odyss. 16. 197 in the sense of 'unless,' or, according to Kühner, Ausführl. gr. Gramm., ed. 2, §512. 4 b, 'except when,' and Bern. and Sus. render it 'unless ' in the passage before us (Bern. 'er habe nichts zu essen, wenn er nicht Tyrann sei ': Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 'he must starve if he were not on the throne '). But if öтє $\mu \boldsymbol{\eta}$ meant 'unless' here, should we not have had $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \eta \hat{\nu} \not \approx \nu$ rather than $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\eta} \nu$ ? I incline, therefore, to translate $\pi \epsilon \omega \nu \bar{\eta} \nu$ ö ö $\mu \dot{\eta}$ тvpav $\frac{\imath}{\imath}$ either 'he was a starving man except when he was tyrant' or (as Mr. Welldon) 'he was a starving man whenever he was not tyrant' (cp. Thuc. 2. 15. 2, оло́тє $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \delta \epsilon(\sigma \epsilon t a \nu)$. The second of these two renderings is open to the objection that it implies that Jason was more than once tyrant of Pherae and that his tenure of the tyranny was not continuous, a fact which we do not learn elsewhere, and as the first is less open to this objection and also has the merit of giving the same meaning to örє $\mu \eta$ in the passage before us as it bears in Homer, perhaps it is to be preferred. A further question is whether Jason meant by $\pi \epsilon \iota \eta \hat{\nu} \nu$ literal starvation (his ignorance of the art of being a private man making it impossible for him to maintain himself in that capacity), or starvation in a metaphorical sense (compare such expressions as 'auri sacra fames'). I incline to
the latter view．A man who does not possess the virtue of an ${ }_{\text {à }}^{\rho} \chi$ ómevos is not thereby incapacitated for earning a living as a ruled person；he is only incapacitated for тò ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ ка入ิิิ． As to Jason see vol．i．p．${ }^{2} 37$ ，note I．Isocrates（Philip．§ 65） describes Dionysius the Elder as＇desiring monarchy in an irra－ tional and frenzied way．＇＇The Venetian chronicler says of Giovanni Frangipane，＇who had resigned the position of Count of Veglia and had retired to Venice，＂He was no more able to live in a free city than night can abide the rising of the sun＂， （T．G．Jackson，Dalmatia，3．135）．
öтє $\mu \grave{\eta}$ тupavvoî．＂${ }^{\text {＂OTE }} \boldsymbol{\circ} \mu \eta$＇is always found in the best authors with the optative＇（Liddell and Scott s．v．öre）．
 as elsewhere．＇Etalveitrat，＇id est，virtus est：habitus enim laudabiles virtutes vocamus，ut ipse ait in fine libri primi Ethicorum＇（Sepul－
 énalveràs äperàs $\lambda$ é $\gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ ）．Compare also Eth．Nic．2．4． 1106 a I
 aiò $\dot{\eta} \mu \omega \nu$ ．Thus the transition from émaveîrau， $\mathbf{2}^{5}$ ，to $\dot{\eta}$ à $\rho \in \tau \dot{\eta}, 26$ ，is an easy one．Agesilaus was praised for knowing both how to rule and how to be ruled（e．g．in Xen．Ages．2．r6）；Lysander，on the other hand，is described by Plutarch（Lysand．c．20）as rò̀ oikoo








 note．
ка入өิ．
29．oủk âv єi゙ŋ ä $\mu \phi \omega$ èmaveєà ò ónoíws．＂$A \mu \phi \omega$ ，the two aptitudes
just referred to．Aristotle hints that the citizen must in fact possess
two different kinds of virtue unequal in praiseworthiness（see vol．i．
p．237）．He here anticipates the conclusion which he is slowly
approaching．So Sepulveda，who has a note on＇Non eodem
modo utrumque laudabitur，＇－＇non erit eadem virtus．＇

Ėmei oûv . . . 32. кatíסot rıs. 'Since then it is occasionally held that the ruler and the ruled should learn different things and not the same, and that the citizen [who is both ruler and ruled] should understand both and share in both, one may see at a glance the further course of the inquiry.' The next step in it is to point out that the citizen should not learn the work of all kinds of ruled persons. Armed with this principle, we are able to reconcile the two contradictory views. Aristotle here, as often elsewhere, sets two conflicting opinions side by side and brings them into collision, in order to show that each contains an element of truth. One view is that the ruler and the ruled should learn different things; the other is that the citizen, who is in part a ruler, should learn both how to rule and how to be ruled, or in other words should learn the same things as the ruled. Both of these views are partly true. Those who hold that the ruler and the ruled should learn different things are so far correct that the citizen-ruler over citizens, and therefore the citizen, should not learn the work of unfreely ruled persons. Those who hold that the ruler and the ruled should learn the same things are so far correct that the citizen-ruler over citizens should learn to be ruled as a freeman is ruled. Thus the truth lies midway, Aristotle thinks, between the two opinions. For $\tau \circ \dot{\nu} \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{\theta} \theta \in \nu$, cp. c. 5 .



 Aristoph. Eq. 13 I sq. Didot by $\mu \in \tau \grave{a}$ roûtov): cp. Eth. Eud. 2. 6. 1223 a 1 sq.
 the order of words (a kind of Chiasmus) is not uncommon in the





 12. 1296b 19-2 : : 7 (5). 12. 1316 a 22 sq. See Kaibel, Stil und
 instances from that work. The occasional occurrence in the Politics of this studied arrangement of words affords an argument
against the view that it is a pupil's hasty report of Aristotle's lectures.
 the kind of rule which obtains in connexion with necessary services.'
 1269 a 35. $\Lambda$ '́youev, in much the same sense as $\lambda^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \gamma \omega$, 36 , though perhaps the 'we' in $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \nu$ is the 'we' of a teacher (cp. c. I. ${ }^{1275}$ b 3, 19). The term $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o t i k \eta$ àp $\chi \eta$ is not always used by Aristotle in the sense of 'the rule which obtains in connexion with necessary services'; it is not, for instance, in 3. 14. 1285 a 22. It should be noticed that by explaining $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \tau \kappa \kappa \dot{\jmath} \dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}$ as $\dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho i$ тàvaүкaia àp $\rho \dot{\eta}$ Aristotle is enabled to represent even freemen who
 not merely absolute slaves.
 $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o v$. In the case of $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o t i k \grave{\jmath} \dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}$ the ruler does not need to know how to do the things that the ruled do, but only how to use their services. Hence in this form of rule he does not need to learn how to be ruled in order to learn how to rule; he does not need to be a slave first in order to be a good master. In the case of $\pi$ òıtık $\dot{a} \rho \alpha \chi \dot{\eta}$, on the other hand, the ruler does need to know how to do what the ruled does, or in other words how to be ruled,
 all that the ruler needs to know is how to use the services of slaves, and even this he hardly needs to know, for this knowledge has nothing exalted about it (4 (7).3. 1325.a 24 sqq.: 1. 7. 1255 b 33 sqq.), and a master may dispense with it by employing a steward
 not need to know how to do the things that slaves do, still less does he need to be able to do them for another. Doing them for another stands on a far lower level than merely doing them and is fit only for slaves (cp. 1277 b 5 and 5 (8). 2. 1337 b 17 sqq.).
 35. Aristotle adds this in order to show that he regards as à $\nu \delta \rho a \pi o \delta \bar{\omega} \delta \epsilon \epsilon$, not only the work of actual slaves, but also that of
 used in the same sense as in 34 , not in that in which it is used in c. 3.1276 b 9 , where it seems to mean 'men commonly say.' The Bavavoos $\tau \epsilon \chi$ virns and the O'ंs are implied to be closely allied to
the slave in 1. 13. 1260a 40 sqq.: 5 (8). 2. 1337 b 2 I: 5 (8). 6. 134 1 b 13 .
38. $\hat{\omega} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda .{ }^{~} \Omega \nu$ refers to $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a \sigma \iota \omega ิ \nu$ according to Bonitz, Ind.
 ${ }_{17}$ sqq. X $\epsilon \rho \nu \eta^{\prime} s$ is a rare, and apparently a poetical, word: $\chi \in \iota \rho o \tau \epsilon \in \chi \nu \eta s$ is the equivalent word in Attic prose.
oûtol $\delta^{3}$ єíoì к.т. $\lambda$. Montecatino's conjecture of aủtต̂ע or aủtó for aủroús is a tempting one (Richards would read aủroîs), and one or other of these emendations may well be right, but it is also possible that as cioiv immediately precedes, we are intended to supply civa from it with aủroús, for Aristotle often omits civau when it can readily be supplied from a neighbouring $\epsilon \hat{i} \nu a t, \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, or $\epsilon i \sigma \iota \nu, \mathrm{e} . \mathrm{g}$. in 2. 12. 1273 b 40 , 3. 4.1276 b 20 sq., 1277 b 26 sq., 3 . 15.1286 b 35 sqq., 4 (7). 10. 1 330 a 25 sq., and 4 (7). 15. 1 334 b 17 sq.; indeed, he sometimes omits it where this is not the case (see notes on 1260 a 14 and 1327 a 34, and Vahlen on Poet. 24. 1459 b 7). Bonitz (Ind. s.v. $\sigma \eta \mu a i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu)$ compares Phys. 4. 7. 213 b 30 , $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$
 of $\chi \epsilon \rho \nu \eta$ 's see Liddell and Scott s.v. To live by manual labour allied a man to the class of slaves (I. II. $125^{8}$ b $3^{8}$ : 1.5 .1254 b I7 sqq.: I. 13. 1259 b 25).
1277 b. 1. êv ois ó $\beta$ ávaugos teXvitخs éctiv. Cp. Solon, Fragm. 13. 49,

In the passage before us $\beta$ ávavao $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu i \tau \alpha \iota$ are included under $\chi \epsilon \rho \nu \eta ิ \tau \epsilon s$, whereas in 6 (4). 4. 1291 b 18-25 tò $\chi \epsilon \rho \nu \eta \tau \iota ⿺ o ́ \nu$ is distinguished from rò $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{l}$ ràs ré $\chi$ vas. Aristotle speaks of $o$ ßávavaos $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu i \tau \eta s$, not simply $\delta \quad \tau \epsilon \chi \nu i \tau \eta s$, because not all $\tau \epsilon \chi \bar{\nu} \tau a \iota$ are $\chi є \rho \nu \eta \bar{\tau} \tau$ s. In Eth. Nic. 1. 4. 1097 a 6 sqq. physicians and generals appear to be included under тєұviтaı. He sometimes, however, uses the word $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu i \tau \eta s$ 'ad significandos opifices' (see Bon. Ind. s. v. $\tau \epsilon \chi^{\nu i} \boldsymbol{T}_{\eta s}$ ).

Sıò map' évíoıs к.т.入. $\Delta t o ́$, because they are slaves (cp. c. 5 . 1278 a 6 sqq.). Kaissling (Tempora und Modi in des Aristoteles Politica und in der Atheniensium Politia, p. 72 ) remarks that the use of $\pi \rho i \nu$ here with an infinitive after a negative principal clause is contrary to the general rule. In $\pi a \rho^{\prime}$ '̇vioss Aristotle probably refers especially to Athens. If so, it would seem that handicraftsmen were excluded from office at Athens not only in the early days when it was confined to Eupatridae (Plut. Thes. c. 25 : Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 2. 8), but even down to the time when the
ultimate democracy＇was introduced（the time of Pericles or later）． According to the＇A $\theta$ ．Под．，с． $\mathbf{1}_{3}$ ，however，the board of ten archons appointed in the year after the archonship of Damasias included two demiurgi．Was Aristotle aware of this？That the fourth and lowest of the property－classes，rò $\theta_{\eta \tau \kappa \kappa}{ }^{\prime} \nu$ ，was excluded by Solon from office is well known（2．12． 1274 a 21 ：Plut． Solon c．18）．Did handicraftsmen belong to this class under Solon＇s legislation，even if they owned land enough to place them in one or other of the three higher classes？At Ragusa the artisans＇had no voice at all in the government，and were not admissible to any office＇（T．G．Jackson，Dalmatia，2．309）．

3．Tà $\mu$ èv oû̉ k．т．入．Mè̀ oûv here，as in 2．9． 127 O b 17 and else－ where，is answered by $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}(7)$ ．Sus．brackets тò̀ à ađaÓv，and it is true that the question with which we have been concerned from 1277 a 29 onwards has been what the citizen and ruler should learn，not what the good man should learn．But the capability of rendering to another servile service has been said to be àvópano－ $\delta \omega \bar{\delta}$ es in 1277 a 35 ，and as the opposite of $\delta$ av $v \delta a \pi \pi \delta \delta \dot{\delta} \delta \eta$ s is ó értetкर́s（Eth．Nic．4．14． 1128 a 17 sqq．：cp．10．6． 1177 a 6 sqq．）， Aristotle＇s first thought is that this capability is not one which should be acquired by $\delta$ ada日ós，his next that it should not be acquired by $\dot{o} \pi{ }^{\text {onctuós }}$（who is $\phi \rho o ́ v \mu \mu o s, ~ 1277$ a 15 ，and therefore áyatós），and his next that it should not be acquired by the good citizen．Compare the story of the captive Spartan youth in Plut．Apophth．Lac．Obscur．Vir．§ 35， 234 B，who replied Oz̉ סovicúvo，when a specially humiliating service was demanded of him．

5．$\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \mu$ ń потє к．т．入．，＇except occasionally to satisfy some need arising for him in relation to himself，for then it no longer happens that the one party（the party to whom the service is rendered）comes to be a master and the other（the party who renders the service）a slave．＇A man who learns to do servile work for himself does not learn to do it for a master，and it is to the good man or good citizen learning to become a slave and to serve a master that Aristotle objects．＇Si quis usus sui gratia sordidum opificium discat，ut Alfonsus dux Ferrariensis，qui singulari indus－ tria et artificio aenea tormenta bellica conficere sciebat，is，quia sibi，non alteri，servit，non debet servus more artificum appellari＇ （Sepulveda）．So Bern．，＇ausser etwa für seinen persönlichen Bedarf，weil in diesem Falle das Herrn－und Sclavenverhältniss
nicht mehr stattfindet.' Vict., however, explains oủ $\gamma$ àp- $\delta 0 \hat{\lambda} \lambda o v$ otherwise, 'si deberet qui regit haec discere, futurum esse ut distingui non possit servus ab ero,' and so Mr. Welldon, who translates, 'else the relation of master and slave ceases to exist,' and Mr. Richards, 'a citizen should not be thoroughly familiar with the ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma a$ of a slave, for then the difference between a master and a slave vanishes.' I prefer the interpretation of Sepulveda and Bernays. Aútê $\pi$ pòs aútóv (a phrase recurring in 7 (5). I. 1302 a 12 and 7 (5).6. 1305 b 13) is to be taken with xpeias


 oủk є́s rò $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a \quad \sigma \dot{\omega} \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \epsilon ̇ \nu a \nu \tau \iota \omega \theta \hat{\eta} \nu a \iota$. For the thought, see note on 1337 b 19, and cp. Rhet. 1. 9. 1367 а 3 1, каi тò $\mu \eta \delta \epsilon \mu i a \nu$




 $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{a} \tau \hat{\eta} \pi a \tau \rho i \delta i ́$, where Plutarch makes a notable advance on the older view. It should be noticed that Aristotle's language in the passage before us is carefully guarded ; the doing of menial work, even for one's own behoof, is only permitted if it is occasional, not habitual, and in satisfaction of a need.
 men exercise over those like themselves in birth and free, for it is of this nature that we say the political rule (the rule which obtains between citizens) is, which [unlike the rule over slaves] the ruler ought to learn while being ruled.' "ApXєı, sc. $\delta$ ä ä $\rho \omega \omega$. That political rule is exercised over men free and equal, we see from 1. 7. 1255 b 20 . Citizens are alike in birth, even though some of them are more nobly born than others, but kings are superior in birth to those over whom they rule (3.13.1284 a II sqq.: 7 (5). 10. 1310b12), and the master of a slave is of course superior in birth to his slave. When Aristotle says in 1. 12. 1259 b 15 that
 probably means 'in race.' Pericles was already familiar with the contrast between rule over freemen and other kinds of rule (cp. Plut. Praec. Reip. Gerend. c. 17 , where we read that he said to

${ }^{〔} E \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu \omega \nu$ ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \varsigma, \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ 'A $\theta \eta \nu a i \omega \nu$ ), and Lysander also, who said, when the Spartan harmost Callibius raised his staff to strike the athlete Autolycus, that 'he knew not how to rule over freemen' (Plut. Lysand. c. I5).
 баขта. For the absence of кai before $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \epsilon i \nu$ see critical note on 1260 a 26 , and cp. 6 (4). 8. I294 a 16 , $\mu o ́ \nu o \nu ~ \gamma \grave{a ̀ \rho ~} \dot{\eta} \mu i \xi \iota \iota$

 not only have been under the command of a general before one becomes a general, for this might be said of a private soldier, but should have risen from the rank of a private to that of a lochagus, and from that rank to the rank of a taxiarch (compare the saying ascribed to the comic poet Crates by Aristophanes in Eq. 541 Didot, quoted above on 1276 b 22 , and the principle underlying the ordo magistratuum at Rome). That the lochagus was subordinate to the taxiarch, we see from $8(6) .8$. I 322 b I sqq. : see also Liddell and Scott, s.v. $\tau a \xi i a p \chi o s$.
11. Sıò $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \tau \alpha \iota$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle probably refers to a saying ascribed to Solon, ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \sigma \nu \mu \mu \theta \grave{\omega} \nu$ ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ (Diog. Laert. I. 60), which Plato may have before him in Laws 762 E (quoted in vol. i. p. 238 , note 1). Cp. also Cic. De Leg. 3. 2.5 and M. Antonin. Comm. II. 29. Kaì тойто, 'this also,' for Aristotle has already said that one should learn to rule freemen by being ruled, and now he goes further and says that it is not possible to rule them well without having been ruled. Alcibiades' experience of being ruled was probably far too short, for he figures as a leading statesman at Athens at a comparatively early age. Even good rulers have been thought to have lost somewhat through too rapid a rise in early life. Some traced Lord Stratford de Redcliffe's 'exceeding masterfulness' to this cause. 'He was pushed up the easiest possible incline to almost the top of the ladder of diplomatic rank before he was twenty-four' (S. Lane-Poole, Life of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, I. 80 ).

 Mév, 'while,' as often elsewhere.
 $\epsilon$ 'тiotagӨat: knowledge is only one of the conditions of capability.

 ßıoтєúєlข.
15. $\dot{\alpha} \rho \in \tau \eta$. For the absence of the article before $\dot{\alpha}_{\rho} \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ see note on 1253 b If.
16. є $\pi^{3}$ ảдфо́тєра, 'on both sides,' i.e. both as ruler and as ruled: cp. Eth. Nic. 6. 12.1143 a 35, кaì ó voûs $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \epsilon ่ \sigma \chi a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ ' ̇ \pi ’ ~ a ̉ \mu ф o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho a, ~$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$ á $\mu$ фóтє $\rho a$ (i.e. both when their repute was bad and when it was good).
 $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ é $\lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$ ảp $\chi \dot{\eta} \nu$. Thus Aristotle's 'best State,' which is composed of $\sigma$ movoiot $\left(4(7) \cdot 13.133^{2}\right.$ a 32 sqq .), is also composed of men who have learnt to rule well by being ruled (4)(7). 14 . 1333 a 2 ) and who interchange ruling and being ruled ( 1332 b 25 sqq.). As to кai . . . $\delta \dot{\eta}$ see above on 1253 a 18.
17. каì єi к.т. $\lambda$., 'and if the temperance and justice appropriate to a ruler differ in kind [from the temperance and justice appropriate to a person ruled but free], for the temperance and justice of a person ruled but free are also different in kind [from those of a ruler], it is clear that the good man's virtue, for instance his justice, will be of two kinds,' [for the good man must have the virtue which fits him to rule and also the virtue which fits him to be ruled.] That the virtue of the ruler is different in kind from that of the ruled we have seen in r. 13. 1259 b $3^{2-1260 ~ a ~} 24$, a passage with which that before us is nearly connected. For the suppression in 17 of 'from the temperance and justice appropriate
 érépà eivaı $\lambda$ '́́youvi rıves äpхoעtos, where 'from that of the ruled' is suppressed, and [Plut.] Consol. ad Apollonium, c. 23, ả $\gamma \nu o o u ̂ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ötı

 examples collected by Bonitz, Ind. s.v. үáp (146 a 50 sqq.), and




 $\sigma \omega \phi$ оотv́vך каi $\delta \iota к a t o \sigma v ́ v \eta$. For the absence of the article before
 є́тavátaбıs. Aristotle had assumed for a moment in an aporetic
argument（ 1276 b 33 ）that the virtue of the good man is of one kind only，but he now arrives at a different conclusion．Plato had already so far distinguished the virtue of the ruler from that of the ruled as to say that $\phi$ póvnots exists only in the ruler（Rep． 433 C）， but neither he nor Protagoras had drawn any distinction between the temperance and justice of the ruler and the same qualities in the ruled，when they said（Plato，Rep． 43 I E－432 B， 433 D ：Protag． $324 \mathrm{D}-325 \mathrm{~A}$ ）that justice and temperance should be possessed by all classes in the State．Aristotle＇s principle is that ruling differs in kind from being ruled，and that therefore the virtue of the ruler differs in kind from the virtue of the ruled（1．13． 1259 b 37 sq ．）． I do not remember any other passage in Aristotle＇s writings in which this view is expressed with equal distinctness．He appears in what follows to connect the difference between the courage and temperance of the man and the woman with the more active and arduous nature of the functions of the man in household management．

$\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．This has been already said in I．I3． 1260 a 21 sqq．， where we are told that these virtues in the man are $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \iota к a i$ and in

 but $\mathrm{A}^{\mathrm{c}}$ has $\tau \hat{\omega} \iota$ in place of the second $\tau o ́$ with a blank space before it large enough for two letters，and Vahlen conjectures oűtos．The
 đóvŋ кaì àvópia，just as it is often absent in similar sentences where ó aùrós occurs：see above on 1276 b 5， 7 ，and 1277 a 13，and cp． 24 ， èmeì kaì oikovopía étépa àvôpòs kaì quvaukós．

 expect to find ákóдa $\alpha \tau o s$, the opposite of $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu$ ，in place of $\lambda$ á $\lambda o s$, and Susemihl on the strength of＇inhonesta＇in Leonardus Aretinus＇ translation places ákó入actos in his text，but 入á入os is probably right． ＾ádos is often opposed to кó $\sigma \mu \mathrm{os}$ ，e．g．in Philem．＇Aóèфoí，Fragm． 2 （Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr．4．5），
oủk，à̀ $\lambda a \lambda \hat{\eta}$ тis $\mu \iota \kappa \rho o ́ v, ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \grave{~ k o ́ \sigma \mu t o s, ~}$



Aíios，it is true，is found only in $\Pi^{1}$ ，but $\Pi^{2}$（except $\mathrm{P}^{\ddagger}$ ，which has
ä $\lambda a \lambda o s)$ have $\begin{gathered}\text { al } \\ \lambda o s, ~ w h i c h ~ i s ~ f r e q u e n t l y ~ f o u n d ~ i n ~ M S S . ~ a s ~ a ~ m i s-~\end{gathered}$ reading for $\lambda a ́ \lambda o s$ (see for instance Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 858 : 3. $5^{67}$ ). L. Schmidt has shown (Ethik der alten Griechen, 1. 313) how nearly akin коб $\mu$ oótทs is to $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \sigma v ́ \nu \eta$. Compare with the passage before us Trag. Gr. Fragm. Adespota 364 (Nauck),
ä $\lambda \lambda$ os $\gamma v \nu a \iota \kappa o ̀ s ~ к o ́ \sigma \mu o s, ~ a ̈ ~ \lambda \lambda o s ~ a ̉ \rho \sigma \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu . ~$
24. є̇mєì kaì к.т.入. For the transition here from aं $\rho \in \tau \bar{\eta}$ to oiko-


 has this passage before him, and probably also Xen. Oecon. 7. 25,

 $\pi \lambda \epsilon i ̂ o \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \rho o s ~ к a i ̀ ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \phi o ́ ß o v ~ \epsilon ́ \delta a ́ \sigma a \tau o ~ \tau \eta ̂ ~ \gamma v v a u k i ~ خ ̂ ~ \tau \hat{̣ ̂ ~ a ̀ v o ̂ p i ̂ . ~ C o m p a r e ~}$ also [Aristot.] Oecon. 1. 3. 1343 b 26-1344 a 8. The account given there and in the passage before us of the household management of the man as being concerned with acquiring is, however, at issue with the usual teaching of Aristotle on the subject, which is that household management has to do with using: see above on 1256 a II. To acquire is more difficult than to keep and demands





 dence [is the only virtue which has not two kinds, for it] is the only virtue which is peculiar to the ruler.' This sentence is a continuation in a rough way of $\mathrm{I} 8-2 \mathrm{I}$. The fem. form iotos is used here, as in 7 (5). 12. 1316 a 12 and De Part. An. 2. 7.652 b 2, in all three cases before a word commencing with a vowel (see note on 1283 a 33). Bonitz (Ind. 472 b 44) gives a number of instances in which the word $\mu$ óvos is placed at the end of a sentence, among
 see above on 1277 a 14 . It has been already said (above on 17) that Plato treats $\phi \rho o \dot{\nu} \eta \sigma \iota s$ as peculiar to the ruler in Rep. 433 C , a passage which Aristotle also has before him when he ascribes סóga ád ${ }^{2} \theta_{\eta}$ s to the ruled. Compare Timacus 5I D sqq. and the contrast between ruler and ruled in Laws 734 Esq . Yet in Laws $63^{2}$ C Plato speaks of instituting guardians of the laws, roùs $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta u ̀$
 Laws there were to be rulers without $\phi$ póv $\quad \sigma t s$, armed only with true opinion (see as to this vol. i. pp. 437, 449). For the effect of 'true opinion respecting what is noble and just and good and the contrary' on the character of the members of a State, see Plato, Polit. 309 C sqq. Bonitz (Ind. 203 b $5^{2}$ ) refers to Aristot. $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \mu \nu \eta \mu \eta s$ кaì

 reappears.
 fiva see notes on 1260 a 14 and 1277 a 38 .
28. ápXo $\mu \in ́ v o u$ סé $\gamma \epsilon$ к.т. 入., 'but as to a person ruled, his virtue is not moral prudence but true opinion, for the ruled person is like a flute-maker, while the ruler is a flute-player, who uses what the flute-maker makes.' The reason assigned seems at first sight to be no reason at all, till we recall i. 8. 1256 a 5 sqq. and I . ro. $125^{8}$ a 21 sqq., where the art that makes is explained to be ministerial ( $i \pi \eta \rho \epsilon \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ ) and subordinate to the art that uses. The ruled person is similarly ministerial to the ruler, and hence has a merely ministerial kind of virtue. Cp. Eth. Eud. 7. 13. 1246 b II, $\dot{\eta}$ रà $\rho$ тov̂


 $\pi o \iota \epsilon i v, \delta \delta^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \eta \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota$, and (with Prof. Jowett) Cratyl. 388 sqq. (esp. 390 B sqq.). $\Gamma \epsilon$ in $\delta \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon$ qualifies àp $\chi^{\circ} \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v:$ see Liddell and Scott S. v. $y \in$ sub fin.
 has been shown to be the same as the virtue of the good man in the case of the citizen of the best State who is possessed of ф $\rho$ óv $\eta \sigma t s$, or in other words who is capable of ruling. For $\pi \hat{\omega} s$, cp. 4 (7). I4. 1332 b 41 sqq.
34. $\dot{\omega}$ s $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \hat{\omega} s \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. The question raised here is probably C. 5. suggested by the mention in c. 4.1277 bx of the fact that in some States handicraftsmen had no share in office till the 'ultimate democracy' came into being. Cp. Polyb. 10. 17. 6, where oi
 craftsmen even in those States shared in the dóóptotos $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \dot{\eta}$ access to which, according to c. 1.1275 a 30 sqq., suffices to make a man a citizen? Aristotle now seems to require that the citizen shall

( 35 sqq .). He appears to hold that if a citizen does not do so, he cannot be said to possess the virtue of a citizen (36). Aristotle's inquiry into the nature of citizen-virtue results, in fact, in a change in his standard of citizenship; at any rate we are told in 1278 a 35 that $\dot{o} \mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a \pi \pi \lambda_{i} \tau \eta s$ is to be found in $\dot{\delta} \mu \in \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \tau \mu \omega \bar{\nu}$.
37. т̀̀ $\nu$ тоцаútŋŋ á $\rho \in \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$, 'the virtue which we have ascribed
 which fits men both to rule and to be ruled.
 of oùros $\gamma \dot{a} \rho \pi o \lambda i \not m s$ seems unnecessary, but it is quite in Aristotle's
 '́̌Xovatv, "oi $\delta^{\prime}$ v́atépas in De Gen. An. 3. 5. 755 b 20 sqq., and see notes on 1282 a 36 and b 39.
 the individual handicraftsman ?' For $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu i \nu \iota \mu \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota$ see Liddell and

 mo入ítךs є́бтiv.
39. $\delta \iota \propto$ á $\gamma є$ тои̂тov тòv $\lambda o ́ \gamma o v$, 'by reason of this statement at any



1278 a. 2. T $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu \in \operatorname{\epsilon i} \eta \eta \mu \in ́ v \omega \nu$, i. e. citizens metoeci and aliens.
тоиิто $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ả $\lambda \eta \theta$ ès к.т. $\lambda$. The preceding sentence has pointed to the conclusion that $\beta$ ávavaot are not citizens, and $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ introduces a justification of this conclusion. For the thought cp. 4 (7). 8 . 1328 a 21 sqq.
4. oưठ' of $\pi a i ̂ \delta e s$, 'not even the children, [though they come nearer to being citizens than handicraftsmen do].' For what follows cp. c. 1.1275 a 14 sqq. The sons of citizens are said to
 but 'on an assumption'-the assumption, namely, that they will become citizens when they grow older.
8. Ėv $\mu$ èv oûv toîs d̉pxaiors xpóvols к. т. $\lambda$. For the use of $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} v$ oủv here see note on $1265 \mathrm{~b} \mathbf{1 2}$. It is answered by $\delta \dot{\epsilon}, 8$. The sense is-' Nay, in ancient times the handicraftsmen were in some States slaves or aliens, but the best State will not go so far as to make them slaves, it will refuse to make them citizens' (cp. 4 (7). 9. 1328 b 33 sqq.). Handicraftsmen would be especially likely to be slaves in military States (Xen. Oecon. 4.3, and Plut. Lycurg. et


 yovoa）．In maritime and commercial States like Corinth，where handicraftsmen were less despised，there would be less eagerness to keep them outside the citizen－body．When Solon offered citizenship at Athens to persons immigrating with their families for the practice of a handicraft（Plut．Solon c．24），he bade farewell to the old－fashioned policy of keeping handicraftsmen slaves and aliens，and aided in the creation of that numerous body of handi－ craftsmen，the existence of which made it possible for Themistocles a century later to build and equip a fleet（Diod．ri．43．3）．That handicraftsmen were often strangers in early days is implied in Hom．Odyss． 17.382 sqq．，and it appears that the first makers of the peplos of Athena were two aliens，Aceseus of Patara and Helicon of Carystus（Leutsch and Schneidewin，Paroem．Gr．1．22）， but，according to Büchsenschütz（Besitz und Erwerb，p．32 1），we do not read in Homer of slaves employed in handicrafts．

7．$\delta$ เómé oi $\pi$ то入入oì toooûto kai vûv．That handicraftsmen were often aliens in Plato＇s day is implied in Laws 848 A ，$\tau \grave{\text { ò }} \mathrm{\delta è}$ т $\rho \boldsymbol{i}$ тov ònulovpyoîs $\tau \epsilon$ кaì đávtos toîs द彑́vols．Cp．also Andoc．ap．Schol． Aristoph．Vesp．1007，where we read about Hyperbolus ©́s $\delta \bar{\epsilon} \xi \in \xi^{\prime} v o s$


 Even at Athens most handicraftsmen may have been slaves or aliens as late as the time of Aristotle，though the Athenian citizen－ body undoubtedly comprised a large number of $\beta$ ávavoor．

9．$\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ кaì oûtos $\pi 0 \lambda i ́ t \eta s, a ̉ \lambda \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．For this use of $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda a ́$ in the sense of＇at any rate＇in an apodosis after a conditional clause
 6． $25^{8}$ b $3^{2-259}$ a 4.

 much difficulty．It is possible that the word àvayкai $\omega \nu$ has been repeated by a scribe＇s mistake from the preceding sentence and has displaced some other word（perhaps ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ，which Bernays would read in place of it）．Another possible view is Prof．Postgate＇s （Notes，p．26），who construes $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime} \dot{\mu} \nu \alpha \gamma \kappa a i \omega \nu$＇and with respect to necessary services，＇but the sentence certainly reads as if $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$
àvaүкаi$\omega \nu$ were masculine．If we take it as masculine，we may translate＇the necessary people，＇so termed in contradistinction to ＇those who are quit of necessary services，＇and compare 6 （4）． 4 ． 1291 a 15 ，тoís àvaүкаioıs $\beta$ обкй $\mu a \sigma \iota \nu$ ．It is thus that Lambinus appears to interpret $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \nu a \gamma \kappa u i \omega \nu$ ，for his rendering is＇eorum autem qui operibus et muneribus necessariis funguntur．＇Tà $\tau о \iota a \hat{\tau} \alpha=\tau \dot{\alpha}$ ảעаүкаïa є̈ $\rho \gamma a$ ．In speaking of slaves as rendering services to an individual，Aristotle forgets the case of public slaves．

 carrying our investigation a little further．＇So we have in Meteor．
 should probably be taken，as Susemihl takes it，with $\mu$ ккрì $\nu$
 Mr．Welldon，takes it．

14．$\alpha u ̛ T \omega ิ v, ~ i . ~ e . ~ \beta a ́ v a v a o t ~ a n d ~ \theta \hat{\eta} \tau \epsilon s$.
aủtò $\gamma$ रà $\rho$ фavèv tò $\lambda \epsilon \chi$ $\theta$ èv motєî $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda \lambda \nu$ ，＇for that which has been said is enough by itself，when once made known，to render this manifest．＇Aristotle probably refers in tò $\lambda_{\epsilon} \chi \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu$ to what has been said in c．1． 1275 a 38 sqq．For фavév，cp．Plato，Gorg． 508 E，
 О．T． 848 ，

$$
a ̀ \lambda \lambda^{\prime} \text { فs фavév } \gamma \epsilon \text { тoü } \pi o s ~ \hat{\omega} \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \epsilon \pi i \sigma \tau a \sigma o,
$$

and Trachin．I．Aristotle evidently has in his mind a familiar



 Orest．inor Bothe，ir 29 Dindorf，

Androm．261 Bothe， 265 Dindorf（for other references to Euripides see Liddell and Scott s．v．oquaive 1．2）：Áristoph．Lysistr． 375 Didot：Cratin．Пu入aia，Fragm． 9 （Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr．2． 114 ）． See also Rhein．Mus．42． 400.

16．каî $\mu$ á入ıбта тоû ápXo $\mu$ évou mo久ítou．Cp．I．I3．1260 a 3 sq．

 the truest sense of the word implies something more than the
award of office according to virtue ; it implies a constitution under which all the citizens, or at any rate all the citizens capable of rule, are men of full excellence (6 (4). 7. 1293 b r sqq.). Cp. 6 (4). 1 r.

 not identify the two expressions. 'A $\xi i$, as Hildenbrand has already pointed out (Geschichte und System der Rechts- und Staatsphilosophie I. 294), attaches not only to virtue, but to property and to every other attribute which gives its possessor a special importance in relation to the life of the State. Tò $\kappa a \tau^{\prime}$ ágià ไ̛oov is commonly
 and $8(6) .2 .1317 \mathrm{~b} 3 \mathrm{sq}$.), whence we infer that constitutions not based on тò Kaт' à $\rho \iota \theta \mu \grave{\partial} \nu$ Ï $\sigma o v$, for instance oligarchy, are based in

 2. 1317b 3 sq.), is sometimes implied to rest them on $\tau \grave{o}$ кат' ágiav
 Wealth, virtue, high birth, education, and even é $\lambda \in v \theta \in \rho i a$, confer $\mathfrak{a} \xi i a$ (Eth. Nic. 5. 6. II 3 I a 25 sqq.). That the wealthy, the well-born, and the free-born have a real, and not merely a fancied, claim on the score of $\mathfrak{a} \xi(a$, , results, I think, from Pol. 3. 12. 1283 a 14 sqq. Their claim, however, cannot compare with that of men superior in virtue (3. 9. 128r a 4 sqq. : cp. 7 (5). r. I 3 or a 39 sqq.), and hence кar' $\begin{aligned} & \text { g } \\ & \xi\end{aligned} \dot{a} \nu$ is especially and most truly used in the Politics, as it is in the passage before us, of $\mathfrak{a} \xi i a$ conferred by virtue (see $4(7) .4$. 1326 b 15: 4 (7). 9. 1329 a 17 : 7 (5). 10. 1310 b 33 ).
oủ $\gamma$ àp oióv $\tau \in$ к.т. 入. Cp. 4 (7). 9. 1328 b 37 sqq. and 8 (6). 4.




22. $\mu$ ' $\nu$, 'while,' as often elsewhere.
23. ảmò $\tau \iota \mu \eta \mu \dot{\tau} \tau \omega \nu$ үà̀ $\mu а к \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$ к.т.д. Not so, however, surely in the first kind of Oligarchy ( 6 (4).5. 1292 a 39-b 2). For $\tau / \mu \eta-$ $\mu a ́ t \omega \nu \mu \pi \kappa \rho \omega ̂ \nu$ cp. 6 (4). 5. 1292 b x and 6 (4). 13. 1297 b 4 : also 6 (4). 4. 1290 b i6 and 8 (6). 7.1321a II.
24. $\pi \lambda$ outoûoı үà̀ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle perhaps has in his mind Hom. Odyss. 17. $3^{86}$, where $\delta \eta \mu$ ок $\rho$ ooi are referred to,



Still Plato (Rep. 406 C ) contrasts oi on $\eta$ нovppoi with oi $\pi \lambda$ ov́cooi $\tau \epsilon$
 majority.' See Stallbaum's notes on Plato, Rep. 562 C and Laws 630 A .
 ठ́є́кa '̇̇тิ̂̀ 'seit zehn Jahren' ('since ten years previously '), Sus. 'zehn Jahre lang' ('for the space of ten years'). In support of Bernays' rendering Kühner, Ausführl. gr. Gramm., ed. 2, § 418.8 b, may be referred to. In Aristoph. Lysistr. 280 the Latin translation
 a sex annis illotus.' But I should prefer Susemihl's rendering of ס́́кa $̇$ ṫ $\hat{\omega} \nu$ if parallel passages from Aristotle's writings can be adduced in support of it. It is conceivable, though perhaps hardly
 appears to mean 'abstained from selling in the agora.' Aristotle no doubt refers to the time when Thebes was under an oligarchical constitution; he contrasts the oligarchy which existed at Thebes with other forms of oligarchy under which it was possible for a handicraftsman to find his way into office, and evidently prefers the strictness of the Theban oligarchy: cp. 8 (6). 7. 1321а 26 ,

及avav́rov ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega \nu \quad$ к.т..入. (It would seem, if we compare this passage with that before us, that abstaining from the practice of a handicraft and abstaining from selling in the agora were much the same thing; handicraftsmen would appear to have both manufactured their goods and sold them in the agora, cp. 8 (6). 4. 1319a 26-30). Xenophon may perhaps refer to Thebes as well as to the Lacedaemonian State when he says in Oecon. 4. 3,

 oligarchies went further and enacted laws forbidding holders of offices to engage in any lucrative occupation (7 (5).12. 1316 b 3 sqq.). Nómos $\eta_{\nu}$ is probably emphatic, as in 2. 9. 1270 b 3 ; there was no concealment in the way in which Thebes excluded Bávavoo from office, as there was in the methods followed by some States ( 1278 a 38 sqq.).
 many constitutions,' etc. Here we pass from one extreme to another, from the extreme strictness of the Theban oligarchy to
the extreme laxity of other constitutions. Aristotle evidently holds, in full agreement with current opinion, that to make aliens citizens was worse than making handicraftsmen citizens. The constitutions to which he refers were no doubt extreme democracies (cp. 8 (6). 4. 1319b 6-19), and it is noticeable that Aristotle does not charge even them with commonly admitting absolute aliens to citizenship, whatever they might do at special crises (see note on 1275 b 34); he speaks in the passage before us of 'some of the class of aliens' ( $\tau \omega \hat{\omega} \xi \in \in \nu \omega \nu$, not $\tau o u ̀ s ~ \xi ' e ́ v o v s)$, and refers in particular to 'persons born of a citizen-mother and an alien father,' i.e. half-aliens. As he distinguishes these half-aliens from ví $\theta_{o}$, he would seem to regard them as born in wedlock. These half-aliens would differ much among themselves; the alien parent would be in some cases a Greek, in others an European or Asiatic barbarian, and a barbarian of high or low position. Cimon was the son of a Greek father and a Thracian princess, Themistocles of a Greek father and a Thracian or Carian woman of less exalted position, and this would be much the commoner case. Many half-aliens would probably be the offspring of marriages between poor citizenwomen and rich metoeci (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 299. r). Similar differences would exist in the ranks of the vó日oo. The term vótos was used in strictness to designate those who were not born in wedlock, even if they were descended from citizen-parents (Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 190). Thus a vóoos might be more purely Athenian than the half-aliens of whom we have been speaking, for he might be the offspring of an illicit connexion between Athenians of full citizen status. Far more frequently, however, he would be the offspring of an illicit connexion between an Athenian citizen and a slave-woman ; occasionally he might be the offspring of an illicit connexion between an Athenian woman and a slave. Gilbert (Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 299. I) holds that in the passage before us Aristotle intends to identify the
 him to assert that these constituted the whole class of vótoo : they were no doubt the largest and least welcome portion of it. The distinction between $\xi^{\prime}$ éot and vótoo is not always maintained : see Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 297. 2, who refers to Pollux 3. 21, vó 0 os $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$
 and to Demosth. c. Aristocr. c. 213.

passage implies that all States which made aliens and bastards citizens did so for want of genuine citizens, a statement which seems to conflict with $8(6) \cdot 4 \cdot 1319 \mathrm{~b} 6$ sqq., where we are told that the founders of extreme democracies adopted measures of this kind, not because they could not help themselves, but with the view of making the demos strong. Aristotle leaves cases of this nature out of sight, for his object in the passage before us is to prove that States only make aliens and bastards citizens when they are forced by necessity to do so, and that, in fact, even the States which do this practically confess that some types of citizen are less authentic than others (vol. i. p. 241). חooov̂vat, 'make for themselves ': contrast $\pi o \neq \eta \quad \sigma \epsilon, 1278$ a 8, and $\pi o o v \sigma \iota \nu, 34$, and compare for a similar transition c. 16.1287 b 29-3 I. Toùs rotoúrous, i. e. ģévovs kaì vóOovs. It would seem from Oecon. 2. 1346 b $13-29$ that at Byzantium the law requiring both parents to be citizens was relaxed at a time of merely financial pressure.
 (literally, 'they have their laws thus'): cp. Aristot. Fragm. ${ }^{5} 55$.

32. єủторойvтєs $\delta^{\prime}$ oैХ $\lambda$ дои к.т.入. The occurrence of $\delta \epsilon$ in the apodosis here after a protasis introduced by $\dot{\epsilon \pi \epsilon i}$ raises a very difficult question. There is no doubt that in the writings of Aristotle, as in those of other Greek authors, $\delta \epsilon$ not unfrequently occurs in the apodosis after a protasis introduced by $\epsilon l$, when the apodosis or some part of it is opposed in sense to the protasis: see Jelf, Gr. Gr. §770. ra. We have instances of this in 3. 16. 1287 b II sqq.: Metaph. B. 4. 999 a 26 sqq.: Phys. 4. 8. 215 b $\mathrm{r}_{3}$ sqq. But the question is whether $\delta{ }_{6}$ occurs in the apodosis after a protasis introduced by $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i$ in the genuine writings of Aristotle. It occurs after a protasis introduced by $\dot{\omega}_{s}$ in the

 referred to in Bon. Ind. 167 a 38), but Bonitz (Ind. 167 a 34 sqq.) and Eucken (De Partic. Usu, p. 3r) hold that in the genuine writings of Aristotle $\delta \epsilon$ does not occur in the apodosis after a protasis introduced by $\dot{\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon}$, and Sus. ${ }^{3}$ reads $\delta{ }^{\circ} \eta$ in the place of $\delta \epsilon$ in the passage before us. Neither Bonitz nor Eucken, however, notice this passage: see Bonitz' discussion of the question in Aristot. Studien, 3.124 sqq., and Eucken's in De Partic. Usu, pp. 26-3r. When in 3.12 .1282 b 14 sqq. a long string of sentences connected

by $\delta \epsilon$ and introduced by | $\pi$ |
| :---: |$i^{i}$ is followed, as it would seem, by an


 be accounted for by the anacoluthic character of the sentence. -The same reason may be given for the occurrence of $\delta \epsilon$ in the apodosis after a string of sentences introduced by $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i$ in Rhet. I. 1. 1355 a ${ }^{-1} \mathbf{- 1} 4$, where the best MSS. have $\delta \epsilon$ in io, though the Vet. Int., supported by a few MSS. not of the best type, gives no equivalent for it. In the passage before us we make a nearer approach to the structure of the passages in which $\delta \epsilon$ occurs in the apodosis after a protasis introduced by $\epsilon i$, for in this passage, as in those, there is an opposition in sense between the protasis and the apodosis, but here again the passage may be anacoluthic, the
 vómoıs, serving to break the grammatical connexion and leading to
 the passage as anacoluthic or as a real instance of the occurrence of $\delta \epsilon \dot{\epsilon}$ in the apodosis after a protasis introduced by $\bar{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon$, there is no need to follow William of Moerbeke in omitting $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ or to substitute $8{ }^{\prime} \eta$ for it.
кađà $\mu$ ккрòv $\pi$ apaı $\rho o u ̂ r \tau \alpha u$. Aristotle appears to be speaking of a gradual change in the law of citizenship, not of such purgations of the citizen-lists as occurred at Athens after the expulsion of the Peisistratidae ('A ${ }^{\prime}$. Под. с. І3) and in в.с. 444 (Plut. Pericl. c. 37) and 346 (Schaefer, Demosthenes und seine Zeit, 2. 289 sq.).


 speaking of the Egyptians. If Antiochus' account of the Partheniae of the Lacedaemonian State (ap. Strab. p. 278) is true, and they were the sons of slaves, their enforced emigration to Tarentum would be an illustration of what Aristotle says here. The children of slaves were commonly thought to be morally below the mark (Eurip. Fragm. 966: Theogn. 537-8).

єîta toùs åmò $\gamma$ vuaıkêv, i. e. sons of a citizen-mother by an alien, not a slave, father (Jowett). It will be noticed that sons of a citizen-father by an alien, not a slave, mother were usually the last to be excluded.
 à $\sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ see below on $1_{3} 10 \mathrm{~b}_{5}$ and critical note on $\mathrm{I}_{3} \mathrm{O} \mathrm{b} 35$.

ถ̊т七 $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ oû̉ к.т. $\lambda$. Mèv oủv is not answered by $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha}, 38$; it has, in fact, nothing answering to it, unless we take it to be eventually
 34-40 we have a summary of the results of the fifth chapter introduced by $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ o $\delta \nu$, and in $127^{8}$ a 40 -b 5 a summary introduced by another $\mu \in \grave{\nu} \nu$ o $\dot{\nu} \nu$ of the results of the fourth chapter, this second
 doubt the fourth and fifth chapters form to a certain extent a connected whole, for the fifth chapter is added by way of supplement to the fourth, it being necessary to explain that there are citizens in whose case the definition of the citizen's virtue given in c. 4 does not hold good, but still there is much awkwardness in the arrangement by which a summary of the results of the fourth chapter is added at the end of the fifth, all the more so as we have already had a brief mention (hardly a summary) of the results of the fourth chapter at the end of that chapter ( 1277 b 30 sqq .). It is doubtful whether the summary in 1278 a $40-\mathrm{b} 5$ is not an interpolation by some editor. It is not quite exact: see vol. i. Appendix B, and note on 1285 b 27 . As to єiò $\pi \lambda \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$ mo久írov, there are citizens who share in office and there are citizens who do not share in office except under certain constitutions.
36. $\mathbf{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ каi к.т. $\lambda$. Kaí, 'for instance,' as in I. 12. 1259b 8. The quotation is from Hom. Il. 9. 648 and 16.59 , where Achilles complains of Agamemnon's treatment of him. Aristotle quotes the words as if Achilles meant ' excluded from office' by àrínтos. The transition was easy for Greeks from the idea of exclusion from office to that of being dishonoured (cp.c.10. I281 a 29 sqq. and Thuc. 6. 38. 5).
 to Eth. Eud. 3. 5. 1233 a 28, סıò кaì ov̉deis à̀ єïmot $\mu \iota \kappa \rho o ́ \psi u \chi o \nu$, єĭ tıs

 Xen. Hell. 4. 4. 6.
38. à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ӧтои к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {., ' }}$ but where exclusion from office is concealed, [there is a bad motive present, for] this concealment is practised by those who resort to it with a view to deceive those who dwell in the same State.' Aristotle uses the expression $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 metoeci and slaves (c. I. 1275 a 7). How hateful a thing it was
to deceive one＇s fellow－citizens appears from the remark of Solon


 to deceive the people was a crime（Hdt．6．136：Demosth．c． Aristocr．c．97）．To wrong бv́vo七кo七 is especially dangerous（Isocr． Panath．§ 178 ）．Most oligarchies openly excluded the many from office（ $7(5)$ ． 8. I 308 b 33 sqq ．），but there may have been some oligarchies，and certainly there were aristocracies，in which an attempt was made to conceal their exclusion from them（6（4）． $\mathbf{1 2}$ ． 1297 a 7 sqq．）．To these aristocracies，as Susemihl has already remarked（Sus．${ }^{2}$ ，Note 518：Sus．${ }^{4}$ ，1．p．379），Aristotle probably here refers．

40．móтєроข $\mu$ èv oûv к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．As to this summary see above on 34 ． For the omission of $\dot{a} \rho \in \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$, cp．1．13．1260 a 24 ，and see vol．ii．p．li． note 4.

2．For the added explanation öть к．т． $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ．cp． 4 （7）．9．1329 a 6 sq． 1278 b． The sentence，if complete，would apparently run，ö́ $\iota \tau \iota \nu \grave{s} \mu \grave{\iota} \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$


3．кảkeivos oủ mâs，＇and not every citizen of the State in which the two are the same．＇
o $\pi$ тодıтькós．With the account given of the $\pi$ олıтькós here com－ pare Xen．Mem．4．2．ir，where the word modıtıkoi is conjoined
 6 （4）．14．1298b 24，from oi є́pүaбтıкоí in Polyb．10．16．x，from oi $\chi$ єıротє́ $\chi$ vaı in Polyb．10．17．6，and from oi iŋmıoupyoi and oi คْク̆ropes in Plato，Apol． 23 E（cp．Diog．Laert．2．39）．In 4 （7）．

 тเкоิ．

4．кa日 aútóv．Sus．${ }^{2}$（Note 52 I：Sus．${ }^{4}$ ，I．p． 380 ）holds that Aristotle is thinking of $\dot{o} \beta a \sigma i \lambda \iota k o ́ s$, but we have been concerned in c． 4 with statesmen who understand both ruling and being ruled，and the reference probably is to magistracies held singly and not in con－ junction with others：cp．Aeschin．c．Timarch．c．IO9，à $\lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ı̈ $\sigma \omega s$ ка $\theta^{\prime}$





C. 6. 6. 'Emєi $\delta$ è к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The question raised in C. I. 1275 a 1 , tiva
 in strictness (cp. 1274 b 38 sqq .) the next question is $\boldsymbol{\tau i} \pi \neq \tau \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \tau i \nu \bar{\eta}$ $\pi o$ ôcs, but this has been answered already in c. 1.1275 b 20 , and Aristotle passes on at once to the question as to the nature of each constitution which he has marked out for consideration in the first sentence of the Third Book. The citizen has been defined by access to office, and as access to office is regulated by the constitution, the question whether there are more constitutions than one, and, if so, how many there are and what differences exist between them, is 'next' ( $\tau \grave{o} \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha} \tau a \hat{v} \tau a)$ dealt with. Aristotle prefixes to his discussion of these questions (see c. 7. 1279a 22 sqq.) an inquiry into two preliminary ones, what is the true end for which the mólıs exists, and what is the true nature of political rule. At the close of this inquiry he no longer troubles to ask whether there are more constitutions than one (he has, indeed, already assumed this in c. 5.1278 a 5 ), but asks at once (c. 7 init.) how many there are.
7. $\kappa \ddot{\partial} v \in i \quad \pi \lambda \epsilon$ íous. Eucken (De Partic. Usu, p. 61) remarks that $\kappa_{a ̉}^{*} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$ is often used just as kaì $\epsilon i$ might be. 'Id iam apud Platonem, Demosthenem, alios invenitur, sed apud nullum saepius quam apud Aristotelem . . . Inveniuntur loci, ubi nihil impedit, quominus äv ex verbo кảy ad apodosin referamus' (he refers among other passages to De An. 2. 10. 422 a II sq.), 'sed multo saepius omnino nulla apodosis est ad quam äv referri possit, maxime in Politicis, in quibus, ut exemplum afferam, saepe compluribus rebus enumeratis postremo loco verbis кà $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i}$ aliquid additur quod magis generale est (cf. Pol. 1. 9. 1257 a 38) ... Sed etiam aliis rationibus kầ $\epsilon \hat{i}$ eodem modo atque кai $\epsilon i$ usurpatur' (Eucken cites the passage before us and 4 (7). 4. 1326 a i 6 sqq.). 'Simili modo кầ $\in i$ etiam in ceteris scriptis adhibetur, sed saepius praeter Politica in Metaphysicis tantum, rarius in ceteris, maxime in Rhetoricis, ubi semel (1. 1. 1354 a 25 ) usurpatur.'
8. Sıaфopai tives aủtêv єiơiv, ' what are the differences between
 $\tau \in$ тoùs $\beta$ ious kaì tàs $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon s$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. This question is dealt with in c. 7 , where the normal and the deviation-forms of constitution are distinguished, and also in c. 8.1279 b 39 sqq . But it receives further consideration in the Sixth Book: cp. 6 (4). 13. 1297 b 31, є̈ть סѐ tives

ë́т兀 סè mo入ıtєía к.т. $\lambda$. Giphanius, Heinsius, and Bernays, fol-
lowed by Sus. and Mr. Welldon, are probably right in translating, 'now a constitution is an ordering of a State in respect both of its other magistracies and especially of the magistracy which is supreme over everything' ( $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ is probably neuter, cp. 6 (4). 4.

 See vol. i. p. 243, note 1 , for other accounts in the Politics of the nature of a constitution. That implied in 3.3 .1276 b I sqq., that it is the $\epsilon i \delta o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \sigma v \nu \theta \epsilon \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ of the elements of the $\pi \sigma^{\prime} \lambda \iota s$, should not be lost sight of. See note on 1276 b 4 .
10. кúpıov $\mu \hat{v} \nu \gamma$ à $\rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. Гá $\rho$ introduces a proof that the constitution is an ordering of the supreme magistracy. It is so because it is an ordering of the $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{i} \epsilon \varepsilon \mu \boldsymbol{a}$ and varies as this varies, and the $\pi \circ \lambda i \tau \epsilon v \mu a$ is the supreme authority of the State. Tò $\pi o \lambda i-$ $\tau \epsilon v \mu a$, 'the supreme authority,' whether One Man or a Few or Many (cp. c. 7. 1279 a 25 sqq., and see vol.i. p. 243, note 2), usually not an individual, but a number of individuals, and thus we read of
 то̀ $\pi о \lambda i т є \nu \mu a \beta a \delta i j$ оvтas). It was, however, possible to be a member of the $\pi \circ \lambda i \tau \epsilon v \mu a$ and yet not to share in the greatest magistracies, as we



11. $\pi о \lambda i ́ \tau \epsilon \cup \mu \alpha \delta^{\prime}$ є́oтiv $\mathfrak{\eta}$ mo入ıтєia, 'and the supreme authority virtually is the constitution.' With Sepulv., Vict., Giph., Heinsius, and Stahr I take $\pi o \lambda i \tau \in v \mu a$ to be the subject of the sentence (for the absence of the article before $\pi о \lambda i \tau \epsilon v \mu a$ see above on 1276 b 28 ). Lamb., however, translates, 'civitatis autem administrandae forma, quam politiam diximus a Graecis appellari, est administratio seu gubernatio civitatis'; thus he makes $\dot{\eta} \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$ the subject of the sentence, and Bernays appears to do so too, for he translates, 'die regierende Klasse bestimmt sich nach der Regierungsform' ('the governing class is determined by the form of government'). This rendering suits well with $8-10$, but not so well with what follows in II sqq., and I prefer the other interpretation. Aristotle proves that the constitution is especially an ordering of the supreme authority by showing that the nature of the supreme authority is decisive of the character of the constitution, from which it follows that the main business of the constitution is to fix the supreme authority. The two words $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$ and $\pi o \lambda i \tau \epsilon \nu \mu a$ are interchanged

 answers to $\tau o \hat{v} \pi a \nu \tau o ̀ s ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \cup ́ \mu a \tau o s ~ o ̉ \lambda i \gamma o v ~ o ̈ \nu \tau o s . ~$
12. For the omission of $\pi \dot{\delta} \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota$ after taîs $\delta \eta \mu$ ократькаîs see above on 1266 b x . We rather expect $\tau$ aîs ỏ入ıүархıкаîs to follow.
13. фацèv סè к.т. $\lambda_{\text {., ' 'and we say that the constitution also (as }}$ well as the $\pi$ oдitєvpa) of these' (i.e. of those who live under the supremacy of the demos and those who live under the supremacy of the few) 'is different.' It is not quite clear whether in $\phi а \mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu$ Aristotle refers to himself and his school or (as Bernays thinks) to the common
 in the next line rather points to the former interpretation.
15. $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, 'the others' (in opposition to $\tau \boldsymbol{v} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega$ ), i. e. those who live under the supremacy, not of the demos or the few, but of some other supreme authority. Or possibly ' the other constitutions.' Susemihl takes the words in the latter way, and he may be right.
úmoөєтє́ov Sì к.т. $\lambda$. We must ascertain the end for which the State exists and the various kinds of rule exercised in relation to man as a member of society before we can say how many forms of constitution there are or discriminate the normal forms from the deviation-forms. For in the normal forms the true end is aimed at and the true kind of rule exercised, and in the deviation-forms neither is the case.
 $\zeta \omega \hat{\eta} s$. We are concerned here only with the kinds of rule exercised in relation to man (not in relation to the lower animals), and still further, only with such as have to do with human beings as associates in life, therefore with those kinds of rule only which are connected with the Household, Village, and State.
 p. xx sqq., and cp. Isocr. De Antid. § 7I, where Isocrates, speaking of his own address to Nicocles, uses the words, $\epsilon ่ \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ov̂̀ $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho o o \iota \mu i \omega$
 is to 1.2 . 1253 a 1 sqq.
19. каї ӧть к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {., 'among other things this also, that' etc. The }}$ passage commencing here, together with c. 9.1280 b 36 sqq . and perhaps 1. 2. $125^{2} \mathrm{~b} 12 \mathrm{sqq}$., seems to have been known to and used by an interpolator of Strabo, p. 419, where we read, $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ oủv






 1284 b 4 sqq. and in the cases noted above on 1276 b 34. For the absence of the article before ${ }^{\wedge} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os see note on 1253 a 10 and critical note on 1253 a 2.
21. oủ $\mu \eta \nu \nu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ к. $\tau . \lambda_{\text {. , ' ' not but that the common advantage }}$ also brings them together, so far as a share in good life falls to the lot of each.' See above on 1252 b 27 sqq., and for the limiting


 $\mu \epsilon \tau а \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu$ єن̉סaı $\mu$ ovias.
23. As to $\mu \epsilon ̀ v$ oûv see above on 1252 b 27 sqq. Toûto, i. e. rò そ̧̀v
 seems to be implied that men do not come together to form the State for the sake of life alone, which does not agree with 24 sqq.
24. ouvépxovtal Sè к.т. $\lambda$. Aủtoî, 'alone' (see note on $1338 \mathrm{~b}_{2}$ 5). Contrast [Aristot.] Oecon. 1. 1343 a 10, $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ o u ̂ ̀ \nu ~ o i k ı \omega ิ \nu ~ \pi \lambda \eta ̄ \theta o ́ s ~$


 noble in life even if we take it by itself.' "Evecit is probably not to be taken with кат̀̀ тò گ̄̀v aủrò $\mu$ о́vov as if кaтúu meant 'in'; it means rather 'in respect of,' and $\tau \hat{\varphi} \zeta \zeta \eta \nu$ should be supplied with
 mónts is formed and maintained, Aristotle shows that rò $\zeta \grave{\eta} \nu$ has in it two characteristics of the end of human action, тò калóv and pleasur-

 $\tau \epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \nu$ тои́т $\omega \nu$ éctiv. Compare with the account of tò $\zeta \hat{\eta} \nu$ in the

 1170 a 25 sqq., and bI: Eth. Nic. 9. 7. 1168 a 5 sqq.: Rhet. 1. 6. 1362 b 25 sqq. Aristotle follows here in the track of Sappho, Fragm. 79,


where Clearchus of Soli, who has preserved the fragment (ap. Athen. Deipn. 687 a: Clearch. Sol. Fragm. 4 in Müller, Fr. Hist.

 the track of Aeschylus, Fragm. I7 I,

(where we should read with Nauck $\dot{\Phi}_{\dot{\Phi}}$ ßios, or possibly ôs Bios, or, with Richards, Biotov, ôs), and Soph. Aj. 473,

Cp. also Aesch. Fragm. 392, Soph. Fragm. 445, 867, and Bacchylides I. 30 sqq. For $\tau o \hat{v}$ калои̂ $\mu$ ópıóv $\tau \iota$, cp. c. 9. I28 I a 9, $\mu$ é $\rho o s$


27. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda_{o \nu} \delta^{\prime} \omega \dot{\omega}$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle perhaps designedly refers to oi $\pi$ oג入oi rather than to oi $\sigma o \phi o i$, thinking that their views are a better guide to what is natural (5 (8). 5. I 340 a 2 sqq. and 5 (8). 6. I 341 a ${ }^{1} 5 \mathrm{sqq}$. ), but he might have said the same thing of some $\sigma о \phi o i$ : see as to the last days of Antisthenes and Speusippus Diog. Laert. 6. 18 sq. and 4.3 . For oi $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i ̀ \tau \omega ิ \nu a ̉ \nu \theta \rho \omega ́ \pi \omega \nu$ cp. Xen. Cyrop. 8. 2. 24 .
30. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} v \ldots \boldsymbol{\epsilon}$, 'but certainly' (see above on 127 I a 20 ).

тท̂s d̉pXฑ̂s toùs $\lambda \in \gamma o \mu$ évous tpótoous, 'the forms of rule commonly spoken of.' Bonitz (Ind. 424 b 40 ) compares Categ. I2. I4 a 26 ,

 translates the words otherwise ('die in Betracht kommenden Weisen der Herrschaft'), and refers to Bernays, Dialoge des Aristoteles, p. 53. Bonitz' translation seems to me to be the right one.
 literally 'external inquiries,' i.e. probably inquiries external to

 See Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2.2. II 4 sqq. (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. iro sqq.) for a full discussion of the meaning of the expression (also Grote, Aristotle, I. 63 sqq., and Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. 56 r sqq.). Zeller remarks (p. 119. 2: Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. II5, note 4) that if we give an extended meaning to the 'we' of $\delta \iota o \rho \iota \zeta \circ \mu \epsilon \theta a$ in the passage before us, it is possible to take


Aristotelian school in the intercourse of ordinary life, but that the use of the term in other passages makes it probable that Aristotle here also refers to writings of his own of a popular kind (possibly to the $\pi$ oגıtıкós and the $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ßaбi入eias).
 is a striking resemblance between the passage before us and Dio Chrys. Or. 14. 439 R.
 exclusive of $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\jmath}$ à $\rho \dot{\eta}$, though undoubtedly the rule of the master over the slave is usually treated in the Politics as a part of
 37 sqq., and see Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 529 : Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. 383 ). We must bear in mind that Aristotle's use of the word रø $\quad$ р $\mu a \tau \tau \sigma \tau \iota \kappa$ n also varies (see note on ${ }^{2}{ }^{2} 56 \mathrm{a}$ ), and that the free members of the household are its members in an especial sense, so that in r. r3. r260 b 8 sqq. the only members of the household mentioned are husband and wife, father and child. Thus in 1. 2. 1252 b 20 (cp. 3. 14. 1285 b $3^{\text {I sq. }}$.) the household is said $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \in v \in \sigma \theta a l$, though the rule of its head over his slaves is of course not a kingly rule. Cp. Hom. Odyss. I. 397, where the oikos is distinguished from the $\delta \mu \hat{\omega} \in S$,


Younger brothers and sisters may be referred to in $\tau \eta \hat{s}$ oikias $\pi$ áa ${ }^{\prime}$
 and cp. also 7 (5). 5. 1 305 a 34, đávтa тòv $\delta \neq \mu 0 \nu)$. In Eth. Nic. 5. 10. 1134b 8-17 (cp. 5. 15. 1138 b 7 sq.), тò oikovoцикòv סíkatov is distinguished from тò $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi o \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\nu} \nu$ סikalov, but is explained as existing between husband and wife only, not between father and child also.
38. $\hat{\eta} v \delta \dot{\eta}$. $\Delta \dot{\eta}$ 'vim relativi urguet,' and means 'just' or 'exactly' (' eben' or ' gerade,' Eucken, De Partic. Usu, p. 43).


 See Schneider's note.



 Aristotle here slightly corrects.


тéxpas, 1278 b 40 : here as elsewhere (see above on $125^{2} \mathrm{~b} 27$ sqq.) $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ oviv ' usurpatur ubi notio modo pronunciata amplius explicatur.'
8. үivetal, 'comes to be': see above on 1252 b 7 and 1264 a 14 . $\pi \alpha \iota \delta_{о т \rho} i \beta \eta s{ }_{\eta} \omega v$, 'though he is a training-master.'
Sıò к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$., 'hence' (i.e. because rule over a household and the rule which is exercised in the arts is essentially for the good of the ruled, and only accidentally and in certain cases for the common good of ruler and ruled) men imply by their acts that rule in a State also is essentially for the good of the ruled, inasmuch as they claim that all should hold office in turn, at any rate when the constitution rests on a basis of equality, thus treating office as a burden which should be borne in turn by all. No doubt this is not the case now-on the contrary, men seek to be perpetually in office, inasmuch as office brings great gains-but we must judge by what was the case formerly, when the state of things was natural. It may be asked how, if ruling is a burden to the ruler, perpetuity of rule, such as exists in a kingship, is fair to the ruler. Aristotle would perhaps reply that the perpetual ruler receives a quid pro quo in 'honour and reward ' (see vol. i. p. 244, note 4).
 to such positions of command as those of the captain of a ship or a physician (cp. c. 16. 1287 a 37 and 4 (7).3.1325 a 19).
9. ӧтаv $\hat{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda$. The suppressed nom. to $\hat{\eta}$ is $\dot{\eta}$ mó入ıs or $\dot{\eta} \pi$ одıтєia, probably the latter, for $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \eta \kappa v i a$ points rather to it ( 6 (4). 3. 1290 a $25: 6$ (4). 2. 1289 a 33, b 16 , etc.), though we have in



10. тро́тєрог $\mu \in ́ v$ к.т.入. Про́тєроע, 'in former times.' As Susemihl has already pointed out (Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 532 b: Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. 384), Aristotle has before him Isocrates' picture of Athens in the days when the Areopagus was strong (Areopag. § 24)-aïrıov $\delta^{\prime}{ }_{j} \nu$ той









 $\pi o \lambda \dot{v} \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ к. т. $\lambda$. Cp. also Isocr. Panath. § 145, and De Antid. § 145 : also Hdt. 1. 97. 2.
11. גetтoupyeiv. Cp. 6 (4). 4. 1291 a 35 sqq. and Andoc. De Myst. c. I32. ムeltoupyєì stands in contrast to ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, io.
 answers (coupled with $\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon \tau a)$ to $\pi \rho \omega ิ \neq \nu$ in 6 (4). 3.1289 b 28 sq .
 repeats Isocrates' phrases quoted above on 10 from Areopag. § 24,

 $\gamma เ \gamma \nu \circ \mu \in ́ v \omega \nu$. Profits derived from office are distinguishable from those derived from public property, for they would often come in the shape of bribes from individuals. It would seem from 7 (5).8. I 309 a 20 sqq. that in an oligarchy, at all events, not all offices were lucrative.
14. Boúخovtal $\sigma u v \in X \omega \hat{\omega}$ ă $\rho X \in \iota v$, as at Thurii ( 7 (5). 7.1307 b 6 sqq.). Compare the reference to oi avvєxєis oîठ in Demosth. Prooem. 55, p. 1461. The repeated tenure of the same office was no doubt often forbidden or discouraged in democracies, but even where that was the case, men might be perpetually in office, if they held different offices.
 (with Sus. ${ }^{1}$ Ind. Gramm. s. v. Mé $\nu$, p. 629 foot) $28-29$ and I. 5. 1254b 16-19: cp. also 8 (6). 7 . 132I a 8 sq., and see Bon. Ind. 454 a 23 , where De Gen. et Corr. 1. 1. 3r4a 8-9 is compared. Tò
 As to Aristotle's distinction of $\dot{\rho} \rho \theta a i \quad \pi \nu \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a \imath$ and $\pi a \rho \epsilon \kappa \beta \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$, see vol. i. p. 215 sq. Is it not, however, possible that in some cases the rule of the holder or holders of supreme power, though exercised exclusively in their own interest, may nevertheless be for the common advantage? Gibbon remarks (Decline and Fall, c. 5) that 'the true interest of an absolute monarch generally coincides with that of his people. Their numbers, their wealth, their order, and their security are the best and only foundations of his real greatness ; and were he totally devoid of virtue, prudence might supply its place, and would dictate the same rule of conduct.' Is it not also possible that there are constitutions in which the rulers rule partly for their own and partly for the common advantage?

And are there not cases in which it is impossible to legislate for the advantage of all, the interest of one section of the population (for instance, producers or consumers) being entirely opposed to that of another? In 8 (6). I. 1316 b 39 sqq., again, we find constitutions mentioned which are partly aristocratic, partly oligarchical in their organization, and others which are partly organized as polities, partly as democracies. These constitutions then will be partly normal, partly deviation-forms.
 which is absolutely just.' Tò ámī̂s סikatov (cp. Soph. Fragm. 699, $\left.\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s \delta_{i} \kappa \eta \nu\right)$ is opposed to סikaıóv $\tau \iota$ in c. 9. 1280 a 22 , and to
 which is no doubt meant $\tau \grave{o} \dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s$ díkatov, is identified with rò коьขท̂ $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu$ in c. 12. 1282 b 17 . It is because the normal constitutions conform to the end for which the State came into being, and adjust their mode of rule to that which should prevail in communities of freemen, that they are pronounced normal according to the standard of absolute justice. Cp. Eth. Nic. 8. I I. 1160 a in sqq.
20. For the place of $\pi \alpha \hat{\alpha} \alpha \mathrm{L}$, see note on 128 I a 26 .
 constitutions are described first in $1279 \mathrm{a} 25-\mathrm{b} 10$. On the other hand, in a later Book (6 (4). 8. 1293 b 3 r sqq.) the study of the Polity, and indeed of the lower forms of Aristocracy, is designedly postponed till Democracy and Oligarchy have been studied.
26. $\pi о \lambda i т є \cup \mu \alpha ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. With all the translators and commentators, so far as I have observed, I take $\pi о \lambda i \tau \epsilon v \mu a$ to be the subject of the sentence. For the absence of the article, see above on 1276 b 28 and 1278 bII .
 Aristotle leaves out of sight the possibility that the One, Few, and Many, or two of them, may share supremacy.
28. тò кowò̀v $\sigma u \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o v, ~ a s ~ i n ~ 33 ~ a n d ~ 37, ~ n o t ~ \tau o ̀ ~ к о \iota v \hat{y ~} \sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o \nu$, as in 17 and 1278 b 21 . Cp. Plut. Phocion c. 21 , Arat. cc. 1o, 24, where тò кoıvòv $\sigma v \mu \phi$ є́pò occurs.
30. tàs $\delta$ è $\pi$ тpòs tò î́ııov к.т. $\lambda$. Cp. Plato, Laws 712 E and

31. $\hat{\eta} \gamma \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda_{\text {., 'for [they deviate from the true standard, inas- }}$ much as they do not admit all the citizens to a share of advantage,
and] either those who share in the constitution are not to be called citizens or they should share in the advantages derivable from it.'
33. калєiv $\delta^{3}$ є ${ }^{3} \dot{\omega} \theta a \mu \epsilon \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Kingship exists for the protection
 it rules for the common advantage. Ideally Kings are guardians both of the rich and of the demos against wrong (7) (5). 1о. 13 гоb 40 sqq .). Polybius (6.4.2), on the other hand, rests the distinction between Kingship and Tyranny on the willingness or unwillingness of the subjects, but this criterion comes to much the same thing as that of Aristotle (see 6 (4). 10. 1295 a 19-23).

 be supplied from vouo日ध́rŋs).
35. тoùs ápíotous ăpхєเv. Cp. c. 18. у288 a 33 sqq.: 6 (4). 7. 1293 b r sqq., 40 sq.: Rhet. 1. 8. 1365 b 33 sqq.


 ou $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \epsilon \iota \tau \bar{\eta} s \pi o \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega$. A definition of Aristocracy by its aim is most in harmony with the method of c. 7 : thus Kingship (33), Polity (37), and the $\pi a \rho \epsilon \kappa \beta a ́ \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s$ ( 1279 b 6 sqq .) are all classified by their aim in c. 7. Perhaps another object with which this alternative definition of ápıттократía is added is to include such aristocracies as those described in Rhet. 1. 8. 1365 b 33 sqq. and 1366 a 5, where the ruling class is oi фatvó $\mu \in \nu o \iota$ ä $\rho \iota \sigma \tau o \iota$ (cp. 6 (4). 7. 1293 b 12 sqq .). The similarity of the language used here to that used in c. 13. 1283 b 40 sqq . should be noticed.
37. о̊тav $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ тò $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os к.т. $\lambda$. The name $\pi$ о $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$ was already used to designate democracy (Harpocr. s. v. $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a$. iסíms єímaatı

 probably is to Isocr. Paneg. § 125 and Demosth. Phil. 2. c. 2 I).
39. $\sigma u \mu \beta$ aiveı $\delta$ ' $\epsilon$ ' $\lambda$ ó $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$, i.e. 'it happens reasonably' that it bears the common name of all constitutions. It seems likely that we should supply these words, but it is by no means easy to explain why Aristotle thinks that this happens reasonably. Giph. (p. 335) explains the matter thus-' cur autem huic reipublicae potius acciderit id quam aliis, ut suo vacans nomine dicatur communi, rationem reddit Aristoteles; quia vix accidat ut multi virtute praediti bonum
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spectent publicum: facilius unus aut pauci reperiuntur tales, multi difficillime. Quare factum est ut regnum et aristocratia essent nota vocabula, multorum respublica vix esset nota et proinde nomine vacans,' and he refers in confirmation of this to 6 (4). 7. 1293 a 39 sqq., where we are told that the polity was of rare occurrence. (Mr. Mark Pattison takes a somewhat similar view in a note written in his copy of Stahr's edition of the Politics-' $\sigma v \mu \beta a i v e \varepsilon \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\lambda} \lambda o ́ \gamma \omega \omega$, viz. that this form should appropriate to itself $\kappa a \tau^{\top} \xi_{\xi} \xi^{\circ} \chi^{\prime} \eta$ the term which is common to all the forms, viz. $\pi$ oגtreia, as it must be more rare than either of the other forms, in proportion as it is more difficult to find many virtuous than to find few or one.') I am myself inclined to suggest whether Aristotle's meaning is not rather this-it happens reasonably that the polity is called by the name common to all constitutions, and not by a special name indicative of exalted virtue in the rulers, such as Kingship (cp. 6 (4). 2. 1289 a 4 I Sq. and 7 (5). то. 13 10 b 3 I sqq.) or Aristocracy, because the Many who rule in the polity will not be possessed of exalted virtue. I can hardly think that Bernays' view of the passage is right, but it deserves mention. He refers quyßaivel $\delta^{\prime}$ єỉdóyos to what follows, not what precedes, translating these words ' bei diesem Verfassungsstaat tritt nun naturgemäss folgendes Verhältniss hervor.' It would be more possible to refer $\sigma v \mu \beta a i v e t \quad \delta^{\circ}$ $\epsilon \dot{v} \lambda{ }^{\prime}$ 'fos to what follows if we could suppose that the passage is anacoluthic, and that, when Aristotle began his sentence, he


 prefixed $\delta$ ourne to the postponed completion of his sentence, thus making it anacoluthic. But this is hardly a likely supposition. The probability is that $\sigma v \mu \beta a i v e t \delta^{\prime \prime}$ eỉdóyos refers to what precedes, not to what follows. Schmidt and Sus., on the other hand,

 seem to me to be better placed where they stand in the MSS.
40. $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ ious $\delta^{\prime} \eta ँ \delta \eta$ к.т. $\lambda$., ' but when we come to a larger number of men, it is difficult that they,' etc. See as to $\bar{\eta} \delta \bar{\eta}$ note on 1268 b 2 I .
1279 b.
 every kind of virtue.' Compare such phrases as $\tau \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \in o s$ s $\pi \rho$ òs àpetinv (Plato, Laws 678 B, 647 D), and cp. Plut. De Solertia Animalium


 ขómоข тєтаүнє́va．
 to carry on $\chi^{a \lambda \epsilon \pi \grave{\partial} \nu} \eta_{\kappa \rho} \iota \beta \bar{\omega} \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \rho o ́ s$, as we might naturally do，for this would give a false sense：what we must carry on is évóé $\chi \in \tau a \iota$




 à入入à катà тò $\lambda \epsilon \cup \kappa o ́ v ~(s c . \sigma \nu \mu \beta \lambda \eta \tau o ́ \nu ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota \nu) . ~$
 in a mass of men．＇See note on 1330 b 38.

3．$\mu \in \tau$ éX 1297 b I，2．6． 1265 b 28，and 3．17．1288 a 12 sq．

5．tuparvis $\mu$ èv $\beta$ aбi $\lambda$ єías．In 6 （4）．2．I289 a 39 sqq．tyranny is implied to be a $\pi a \rho \epsilon \in \kappa \beta a \sigma \iota s$ of the $\pi a \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a$ ．

6．$\grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ үàp тupavvis к．т．$\lambda$ ．Cp． 7 （5）．10．I3II а． 2 sqq．and Thuc．I．I7．＇It is but justice to Meg Dods to state that though hers was a severe and almost despotic government，it could not be termed a tyranny，since it was exercised upon the whole for the good of the subject＇（Sir Walter Scott，St．Ronan＇s Well， p．13）．The Scholiast on Aristophanes，speaking of the terms




7．ท่ $\delta^{\prime}$ ỏ $\lambda \iota$ เүархí к．т．$\lambda$ ．We should naturally supply écтì $\mu$ оvapxia， but of course $\epsilon \sigma \tau i$ only must be supplied．

9．тò T仑̂ kotvệ $\lambda u \sigma \iota \tau \in \lambda o u ̂ v$ ，＇that which profits the whole body

 875 A－B．
 three deviation－forms（cp． $16-19$ ），though tyranny soon drops out of view．For the question tis éкáoтŋ cp．c．1． 1274 b 32.
 2．5． 287 b 28 sqq．and Anal．Post．2．13．96b35－97 a 6.

15. $\delta_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ oûv, 'to make fully manifest': see note on 1253 a ro.
 1279 b 6 and c. 6. 1279a 2I) 'a form of monarchy ruling over the political association as a master rules over his slaves.' T $\bar{\eta} s{ }^{s} \pi \lambda \lambda \tau \tau \kappa \bar{\eta} s$ кодขшvias appears to be in the genitive after $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ отıк' (see Liddell
 Xen. Oecon. 13. 5). In c. 6. 1279 a 21 the $\pi$ ódıs is said to be an association of freemen; hence tyranny is evidently wrong and receives no further consideration.
17. ödıyapxia $\delta$ è к.т. $\lambda$. This agrees with Plato, Rep. 550 C, except that Plato adds that the poor have no share in office.
18. kúplot Tท̂s mo入ıtтías. Cp. 24, 33, 6 (4). 14. 1299 a 1, and 8 (6). м. 1316 b 32.
$\delta \eta \mu$ ократі́a $\delta \bar{\epsilon}$ к.т.入. In the first form of democracy the law refuses to give supremacy either to rich or to poor, still, as the poor are in a majority, supremacy necessarily falls as a matter of fact to them (6 (4). 4. I29rb3i-38).
 that the änopor in the Politics are not altogether without property, but have not much property. Cp. 6 (4). 13. 1297a 20, where

 of whom we read in 8 (6).5. 1320a 32 sqq., 2. 9. 1270 b 9 , and 1271a 30, but they do not appear commonly to have had any slaves ( 8 ( 6 ). 8. 13 23 a 5 sqq.), and unless they received pay from the State ( 6 (4). 6.1293 a I sqq.), they were obliged to work hard for the support of themselves and their families ( 7 (5).8. 1309 a 4 sqq.). As to oi $\pi$ iévpres see note on 1297 b 6 .
 autem prima de definitione controversia,' and so Vict. Giph. Bern. and Sus. ('the first difficulty affects the definition'): Lamb., however, 'prima autem difficultas ac dubitatio ad superiorem distinctionem pertinens est haec.' The former interpretation is probably to be preferred. For the absence of the article with




 definition of oligarchy and democracy given in the foregoing (c. 7 .

1279 b 6-c. 8. 1279 b 19) has represented the former as a constitution in which a few rich rule and the latter as a constitution in which many poor rule, and has failed to make it clear whether both characteristics (the fewness and the wealth of the rulers in the case of oligarchy, and their numbers and poverty in the case of (lemocracy) are essential features of the two constitutions, or, if not, which of them is so. This question, however, requires an answer. A similar inquiry as to the nature of oligarchy and democracy occurs in $6(4) \cdot 4$. I290 a 30 sqq. (where, however, no reference is made to the earlier discussion), but the inquiry contained in the chapter before us is far the more satisfactory of the two. See note on 1290 a 30 . It should be noticed that though constitutions in which the rich, being a majority, rule on the ground of their wealth are here implied to be oligarchies, and constitutions in which the poor, being a minority, rule are implied to be democracies, no place is made for oligarchies and democracies of this type in the classification of forms of oligarchy and democracy contained in 6 (4).4. I29I b 30 sqq. and 6 (4). 5. 1292 a 39 sqq.
22. toupkairnt. See above on 1260 b 31, and critical note on 1279 b 22.
32. TทेV Ėv ท̂ $\pi \lambda$ eious єü̉mopou, 'that in which there is a majority of rich men.' For $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ e่v $\eta_{\eta}$ Bonitz (Ind. 495 a 14 sq.) compares
 к.т. $\lambda$.
38. Sıò kaì oủ $\sigma u \mu \beta a i v \in \iota ~ k . \tau . \lambda$. With ràs pip $\theta$ eifas I supply airias (not $\pi$ oोırєias, as Bernays), and take these words to refer to $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{o s}$ and ódıyór $\eta s$, translating thus-''hence' (i.e. because $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$ and ì $\lambda$ tór $\quad$ ns are accidents and not differentiae) 'it also does not happen
 to be causes of a difference between oligarchy and democracy.' Prof. Jowett (Politics 2. 124) and Prof. J. A. Stewart (Class. Rev. 9. 456) have anticipated me in this view of the passage. One airias is made to serve for two, much as one $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \notin \epsilon \nu$ is made to serve for
 катà тò $\gamma$ '́vos (sc. $\mu \epsilon \tau \in ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu), \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \tau o \iota ~ \delta v \nu a \mu e ́ \nu o v s ~ \sigma \chi o \lambda a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu . ~ S e e ~$ also note on 1326 a 34 . For airias סıaфopâs cp. 1280 a 5 and 6 (4). 6. 1292 b 33 , тои̂тo $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ oủv cioios ề $\delta \eta \mu$ ккратias סià taúvas ràs aitias. A definition of a thing must not be built on a distinguishing feature which is only an accident and not present in every case (Top. 6.


 $\mu \dot{\eta} \dot{v} \pi u ́ \rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu)$.
1280 a . 1. $\mu \in ́ v$, answered by ả̉ $\lambda \lambda a^{2}, 3$, marks the antithesis between that which is necessary and to $\sigma v \mu \beta \epsilon \beta \eta \kappa$ ós: it is on the former that the real $\delta \iota a \phi o \rho a ́ ~ b e t w e e n ~ o l i g a r c h y ~ a n d ~ d e m o c r a c y ~ r e s t s . ~$


 raîs ỏ入ıyapxiats.
 tinguishing principles of oligarchy and democracy men put forward ' [before we go on to examine their soundness], 'and what is the oligarchical and the democratic version of what is just.' Cp. c. 6.
 каӨólov $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu$ тàs à $\rho \chi$ às $\kappa_{0} \tau . \lambda$. Liddell and Scott render öpos in passages like that before us as 'end' or 'aim,' comparing Rhet. i. 8. $1366 \mathrm{a}_{2}$ sqq., but perhaps its meaning here is rather 'mark' or 'distinguishing principle' ('id quo alicuius rei natura constituitur et definitur,' Bon. Ind. 529 b 44) : cp. Plato, Polit. 292 A.
8. тò Síкаьоv тó тє ठ̉入ıуархıкòv каì $\delta \eta \mu$ ократькóv. For the absence


9. $\pi$ ávtєs is explained by Sus. as here $=$ ả $\mu \phi$ órєроt. See Sus. ${ }^{4}$ on the passage before us and on 1273 a 8 . So in $40 \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ means 'for both': for this use of $\pi a ́ v r e s, ~ ' u b i ~ d e ~ d u o b u s ~ t a n t u m ~ a g i t u r, ' ~ ' ~$ see Bon. Ind. 57 I b 50 sqq.
åmtoитat Sıkaíou тıvós. Bonitz (Ind. 89 b 56) compares Eth.



 ground of claim,' ' a principle which is in a degree just.' Dikatóv
 Síxalov.
10. $\mu$ éxpl tıvós, '[only] to a certain point': see note on 1282 a 36.
11. oîov Sokєî ïouv rò Síkalov єival. To show that the views of democrats and oligarchs as to what is just are only partially correct, Aristotle takes first a view prevalent among democrats and then (in
12) a view prevalent among oligarchs, and points out that neither


 Bothe (547 Dindorf),



12. kaì тò â้vıซov סокє̂̂ Síkaıov єival. Cp. 2. 7. 1267 a 1 , where see note.
14. àфaıpoûбı, 'take away,' 'strike off': àфaıpeì is here, as often elsewhere, opposed to $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau \iota \theta^{\prime} v a$. It would seem, however, from 19, $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ ois $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau o \hat{v} \sigma t$, that the advocates of oligarchy and democracy did not ignore the fact that the determination of what is just involves a question of persons, but that they each gave a different answer to this question and, as it turns out, a wrong one.



16. $\check{\omega} \sigma \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \in \pi \epsilon i$ k. т. $\lambda .$, ' and so, since what is just is relative to persons and is divided in the same way in respect of the things distributed and the persons who receive them' (i.e. since a just allotment of things to $A$ and $B$ will correspond with and follow the just claims of $A$ and $B$ respectively), 'as has been said before in the ethical discussions, they agree as to the equality of the thing, but differ as to the equality of the persons.' Cp. Eth. Nic.



 one person stands to the other in the proportion of two to one, a just distribution will make the things stand to each other in the same proportion). Both in this passage and in that before us
 to this use of the perfect see Vahlen on Poet. 5. I449 b 9 (p. II4), quoted below on 1282 b 24 . I have translated $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau o v ̂ \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau o s$
 equality of the thing, but differ as to the equality of the persons,' but there is a further question what these words exactly mean. Perhaps 'they agree as to what constitutes equality in the thing,
but differ as to what constitutes equality in the persons.' For
 тол兀геіая.
20. $\delta$ เótı. ' $\Delta$ tótı non raro usurpatur pro verbo ö́tı, veluti . . . Pol. 3. 9. 1280a 20 (quamquam ibi causalem vim habere potest), observes Bonitz, Ind. 200 b 43 (see his remarks in 45 sqq.). Bernays and Susemihl render otót by 'because' in the passage before us, but I incline (with Bonitz and Mr. Welldon) to the rendering 'that': $\delta \iota o ̛ \iota \iota$ may well be used in place of ö̃九 because ä $\rho \tau \iota$ precedes.
 with what is said here. Cp. also Plato, Protag. 33 I E, à $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oúxì tà


24. éheu $\begin{gathered}\text { epiaq. See vol. i. p. } 248 \text {, note I, as to the meaning of }\end{gathered}$ this word.
25. тò кupi(́tatov evidently is the aim with which the $\pi$ öncs was founded.


 тติข ктпиа́тшv. See above on 1258 a 33 .
26. èkotvต́vnoav kaì $\sigma v \eta \hat{\eta} \lambda \theta$ ov. Kotvavia is possible wihout rò



 original sum nor of the accruing profits,' for Bernays can hardly be right in rendering these words 'whether it be the first founders of the company or their successors' ('mögen es nun die ersten Begründer der Gesellschaft oder deren Rechtsnachfolger sein'). These words seem to be epexegetic of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\varepsilon} \kappa a \tau \grave{\partial} \nu \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu, 29$, and to be, like them, in the gen. after $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \chi \epsilon \nu$. Sharing in the hundred minae includes sharing not only in the sum originally contributed, but also in the profits accruing from it. The word $\bar{\epsilon} \pi r \gamma^{e} \varphi \eta \mu a$ is often used in the Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus in the sense of 'surplus.' Cp. also émeankev in I. 11. 1259 a 27 sq.

 29 the $\pi \dot{0}{ }^{2}$ es is said to come into existence for the sake of life, though it exists for the sake of good life. The protasis which
begins here expires in $3^{6}$ sqq．without being succeeded by an apodosis．If an apodosis had followed，it would evidently have been to the effect of סóóтє örot к．т．入．，1281 a 4 sqq．
 23 ，and cp．＇A $\theta$ ．חod．c． 57 ，line 3 I．Slaves do not share in eviout－ $\mu o v i a$（compare－with Mr．Congreve－Eth．Nic．ıо．6． 1177 a 8，
 in accordance with $\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma t s$ ：in this they might share without sharing in tivoaumovia（they might live，for instance，in accordance with a vicious $\pi$ тoaipetis，which would not bring them evioaupovia）． That slaves have not $\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma t s$ ，we see from Pol．I．I3． 1260 a



 can act the part of a citizen without $\pi \rho o a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau$ ．The notion of a＇city of slaves＇is as old as Hecataeus（Fragm．318：Müller， Fragm．Hist．Gr．I．24），and there was a proverb écrì kaì סoú入̀ $\omega$

 8ıà tò onáviov eîp prat（ibid．I．324，433）．Just as there were those who knew where to look for the mythical land＇where mice eat iron＇（Herondas 3． 75 ：Crusius，Untersuchungen zu den Mim－ iamben des Herondas，p．73），so there were those who found a＇local habitation＇for＇the city of slaves．＇Hecataeus said that it was in Libya（Fragm．318），and was followed by Ephorus （Paroem．Gr．1．433，note ：cp．2．371）；others placed it in Crete or Egypt；in a fragment of the Eєpi申ıo of the elder Cratinus （Meineke，Fragm．Com．Gr．2．133）we read



on which see Meineke＇s note，and cp．Fragm．Com．Gr．2． 506. On the other hand，Anaxandrides，who was a senior contemporary of Aristotle，placed in the mouth of one of the characters of his ＇A $\mathrm{A} x i=\eta$ s the lines（Meineke，Fragm．Com．Gr．3．162），


and perhaps they are present to Aristotle＇s memory here．Meineke （Fr．Com．Gr．5．xl）refers to Lehrs，Ep．Qu．p． 85 on the subject，
which I have not seen. Aristotle again dismisses the idea of a city composed wholly of slaves in c. 12.1283 a 18 sq. : compare also c. 6.1279 a 2 I.
 strictness the term for an engagement for mutual defence against attack was $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \mu \mu \chi i a$, but $\boldsymbol{\sigma \nu \mu \mu \chi i ́ a}$ was often used in this sense, as here (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 387 , who refers to Thuc. I. 44 and


 that the $\pi \delta^{0}$ ıs is formed for protection against wrongs inflicted by all and sundry is not the same thing as to say that it is formed to protect its members against wrongs inflicted on them by each other. It is evident that Aristotle has the latter view of the origin of the $\pi 0$ ólss before him in 39 and in 1280 b 4 : hence it is not quite certain that he is thinking of the former in the passage before us, though his language is such as to admit of this interpretation. The view, however, that the $\pi$ ónts was formed for protection against attacks from those outside it is a very tenable one, and deserved more consideration than it here receives. The rise of the $\pi$ ódss out of a collection of scattered villages was probably often due to a wish for better protection against hostile attack than the village régime could offer. Thus the Athenian general Demosthenes was encouraged to invade Aetolia because the Aetolians lived in scattered and unwalled villages (Thuc. 3. 94.4), and Megalopolis was founded to protect South-West Arcadia against Lacedaemonian attack (Paus. 8. 27. r). Another and probably still more common origin of the $\pi \dot{0} \lambda \iota s$ in early times was that described by Lucretius (5. 1 108),

Condere coeperunt urbes arcemque locare
Praesidium reges ipsi sibi perfugiumque.
To cases of this kind Aristotle makes no reference.
 imagines for the $\pi$ ódes in Rep. $3^{69}$ A sqq. (see vol. i. p. ${ }^{6}$ ). Cp. also $8(6)$. 8 . 132 I b 14 sqq., where Aristotle says that the buying and selling of necessaries is thought to be the original cause which brings men to group themselves under one constitution.
36. As to the relations of the Etruscans and Carthaginians see Meltzer, Geschichte der Karthager r. 168 sqq. and Mommsen, History of Rome, Eng. Trans., I. 153. The Phocaeans settled
about b.c. 560 at Alalia (Aleria) in Corsica, opposite to Caere, and about twenty-five years later (Busolt, Gr. Gesch., ed. 2, 2. $753-755)$ they were expelled by a combined fleet of Etruscans and Carthaginians-an evidence of the alliance of which Aristotle here speaks. According to E. Meyer, Gesch. des Alterthums 2. 708, Aristotle refers to treaties concluded between Carthage and each of the Etruscan seacoast cities separately, not between Carthage and a central Etruscan authority ; this may be so, but one would hardly have guessed it from Aristotle's language. His words appear to imply that States which were not connected by $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta<\lambda a$ did not commonly trade with each other.

 between States had to do with exports and imports, but when a State had surplus products to export or needed to import products, it made a $\sigma v \theta^{\prime} \ddot{\eta}^{\prime} \eta$ with States willing to take exports from it or to supply it with imports, the object of the $\sigma v v \theta \theta^{\prime} \kappa \eta$ being to facilitate and regulate this trade. Compare Rhet. I. 4.





 Hicks, Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions, No. 74 (p. 129). When States were linked together by a mutually advantageous commerce of this kind, it was important that provision should be made for the peaceful settlement of disagreements arising between individual citizens belonging to them, and hence $\sigma$ ú $\mu \beta o \lambda a$ were
 indeed have occasionally existed between States not linked together
 of legal process for the trial of offences committed by members of the one State against those of the other, in order that sufferers by those offences, or the State to which they belonged, might no longer be obliged, if they wished to obtain redress for them, to resort to forcible reprisals. The provisions of these $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta$ ò̀a were probably very various; a common one in those concluded by Athens was that offenders were to be proceeded against in the courts of the State to which they belonged, though the prosecutor
might appeal from their decision to a third State ( $\notin к к \lambda \eta \tau о s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda ı s) . ~$ What the provisions of the $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \beta \dot{\lambda} a$ between Etruria and Carthage were, we have no means of knowing. As to $\sigma \dot{\mu} \mu \beta o \lambda a$ see C. F. Hermann, Gr. Ant. 1. 2. 432, ed. Thumser, and Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. $43^{2}$ sqq., and Gr. Staatsalt. 2. $3^{80}$ sqq. Грaфai $\pi \epsilon \rho i \quad \sigma v \mu \mu a \chi i a s$, for not all alliances were in writing (Polyb. 3. $25 \cdot 3$ ).
40. $\mathfrak{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ оüт ${ }^{2}{ }^{2} \rho \chi$ aì к.т. $\lambda$. Peloponnesus is regarded by Polybius (2.37) as in his day all but one $\pi$ ó $\lambda \iota s$, inasmuch as it had the same laws, weights and measures, and coinage, and also the same magistrates, councillors, and dicasts, the only thing wanting being a common wall. Hârıv, 'for both,' see above on 1280 a 9. 'E $\pi i$ тoviтoוs is rendered by Sus. and Welldon 'to secure these objects' (cp. 1. 2. 1253 a 14), but Bonitz (Ind. 268 b 8) groups this passage
 evidently interprets $\bar{\epsilon} \pi i$ zoúrots 'over these things,' 'charged with jurisdiction over these matters.' I incline on the whole to follow

1280 b. 1. For the construction, if $\tau o \hat{v}$ is omitted before $\pi o i o u s$ (with Ms $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ Vat. Pal. and perhaps $\Gamma$ ), cp. Eth. Eud. 3. 5. 1232 b 6, каï $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$
 $\nu$ vovil, but the construction with the genitive is far more usual. For


 of the same State seek to make each other good had been pointed out in a famous passage of the discourse of Protagoras in Plato, Protag. 327 A sq., where the speaker says, $\lambda v \sigma \iota \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i ̂ ~ \gamma a ́ \rho, ~ o i \mu a \iota, ~ i ̀ \mu i v ~$


 and there can be little doubt that $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ pr. $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ are wrong in omitting it. These MSS. are prone to omit words ; they also give the next

 before us, кaт' ápet $\eta$ follows in the next line, and 5 (8). 6. I 340 b 42, тoîs $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \rho \epsilon т \grave{\eta} \nu \pi a \iota \delta \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \iota к \grave{\eta} \nu$ (where see note). Cp.



but Aristotle probably remembers that not all $\pi \dot{0} \lambda_{\text {eis }}$ cared for the promotion of virtue in their citizens．Hence he prefers to appeal here，as he does in 2．5．1263 a 3 I sq．and Rhet．I．I．1354 a 18 sqq ．，to the practice of those who care for cuvopia，or in other words of those who are truly $\pi$ тлıгєкоi，for єivoцia is the end of the political science（see above on 1253 a 37 ，and Eth．Nic．3． 5. 1112 b 14 ，Eth．Eud．1．5．1216 b 18），and of any $\pi \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{\lambda}}^{\mathrm{l} s}$ which deserves the name（ 6 sqq. ）．For $\delta \iota a \sigma \kappa o \pi \epsilon i \nu, ~ ' t o ~ c o n s i d e r ~ c a r e f u l l y, ' ~$ cp．Eth．Eud．I．8．1217b 16 ，where it is contrasted with $\sigma v \nu \tau o ́ \mu \omega s$ єireiv，and Thuc．7．7r． 6.
 eivat k．т．入．，Bonitz（Ind． $275^{\text {a }} 43$ sq．）compares Hist．An．3．3．513 a
 Not all móntıs are regarded by Aristotle as making the promotion of virtue a matter of public concern（Eth．Nic．Io．Io．II80 a

 all $\pi$ ó $\lambda \epsilon$ which deserve the name should do so．Still，even where the $\pi$ ólıs failed to do this，much was done for virtue by other agencies at work within it，as we see from the address of Prota－ goras in Plato，Protag． $3^{25}$ C sqq．So that Aristotle＇s view that a módıs omitting to make the promotion of virtue a matter of public concern becomes a mere＇alliance＇does not seem to be altogether true．

8．үivєтає $\gamma$ àp к．т．$\lambda$ ．，＇for otherwise，＇etc．Sus．，following Conring，reads $\sigma \nu \mu \mu a \chi \iota \omega \nu$ in place of $\sigma v \mu \mu a ́ \chi \omega \nu$ ，which is the reading of $\Gamma \Pi$ ，but $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \stackrel{a}{ } \boldsymbol{\pi} \circ \theta \epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \sigma v \mu \mu a \chi \iota \hat{\omega} \nu$ is an awkward phrase needing to be justified by parallel instances，and we should probably supply गेंs $\sigma v \mu \mu a x i a s$ before $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä à $\lambda \omega \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä $\pi о \theta \in \nu \quad \sigma v \mu \mu a ́ \chi \omega \nu$ ．Cp．Plato，
 ขєavíткои єủyєvoûs；We have perhaps in $\sigma v \mu \mu a ́ \chi \omega \nu$ a similar irregu－ larity to that which often occurs in comparisons（see note on 1267 а 5，$\mu \epsilon i \zeta \omega \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \nu a \gamma к а i \omega \nu$ ，and cp．Meteor．1．4． 342 a
 ṕıттovpévoıs，and Xen．Cyrop．5．1．4，кaì toívvข ópoíà tuîs סoú入aıs
 comparatio，c．II，$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ є̈ $\xi \omega \theta \in \nu \sigma \nu \mu \mu a ́ x \omega \nu$ ．

10．каi ó vó $о$ оs $\sigma u v \theta$ そ́к $\eta$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．See vol．i．p． 389 ．As to the sophist Lycophron see above on 1255 a 32 ，and see Sus．${ }^{2}$ ， Note $55^{2}$（Sus．${ }^{4}$ ，1．p．393）．In Aristot．Fragm．82． 1490 a 10 he is
spoken of as a writer. 'O бoфөттis is added to distinguish this Lycophron from others who bore the same name. This view of the object of law was inherited by Epicurus: see Zeller, Stoics Epicureans and Sceptics, Eng. Trans., p. 462 sq., who refers to


 àठıkêvтat: Lucr. 5. II 43 sqq. To Schopenhauer 'the State is in essence nothing more than an institution designed for protection against external attacks directed against the whole and against internal attacks made by individuals on each other' (see the references in Frauenstädt's Schopenhauer-Lexikon 2. 343 sq.).
 à $\mathbf{a} a \theta 0$ ous, partly to sharpen the contrast with $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \delta \iota \kappa a i \omega \nu$ in the preceding line. In much the same way we have à $\rho \in \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ кai $\delta \iota \kappa a a o-$
 $3^{6}$, where кai $\delta \iota \kappa a t o \tau i v \eta \eta$ is added because Aristotle is about to prove that $\dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon r^{\prime}$, relative to the constitution exists by proving the existence of $\delta$ okatooivp relative to the constitution. Another reason for adding kai oıkaious in the passage before us may be that bravery is often connoted by áyaOós more than anything else (see note on

 Pol. 7 (5). 9. 1309 a 36, and Poet. 13. 1453 a 8.
 a $\pi \mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{o}}^{\text {cs }}$, if it does not care for the promotion of virtue. Aristotle proves this by showing that nothing short of participation in good life constitutes a móds, or at any rate what would be
 1280 b 28 )-that unity of site is not enough, even if combined with intermarriage, nor nearness, or even unity, of site combined with the exchange of products and laws for the punishment of persons wronging each other in that exchange.
14. Toùs тómous, 'the sites of two cities.'
16. èmıyauias, plural, as in $3^{6}$ and in Rhet. r. 14. $1375^{\text {a }} 10$, and these are the only passages in Aristotle's writings in which the Index Aristotelicus notes the occurrence of the word.
 munion which are characteristic of States.' As to the right of intermarriage see Hdt. 5.92 and Thuc. 8. 21, referred to by Eaton,
passages which show that it did not always exist between members of the same $\pi$ odits. See also Plut. Thes. c. r3, from which it would seem that it did not exist between the two Attic demes Pallene and Hagnus, whether permanently or not, we are not told. Nor was it exclusively possessed by members of the same $\pi$ ôts, for it was often granted by Greek States to the citizens of States on friendly terms with themselves (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 378 sq.). The
 Aristotelicus gives no other instance of its occurrence in those of Aristotle.
 'but they had laws for the sake of preventing the infliction of
 aủroùs àôıкєiv, see Bon. Ind. 149 b 13 sqq. Cp. Oecon. I. 4. 1344 a
 aủròs àòıкoîto.
20. oiov єi к.т.入. Aristotle has in his mind Plato's supposition in Rep. 369 A sqq.: cp. 6 (4). 4. 1291 a 10 sqq . Kaì $\boldsymbol{\text { rò }} \pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \theta$ os eiev $\mu$ úptoc is added, because he is not content with the four or eight members which Plato had implied were enough to constitute a $\pi$ ò̀ıs, and wishes to place the aủtápкeta èv roiss àvaykaious of the imagined community beyond all question.
 c. 1.1275 a 32 , $\tau$ ov̀s oűt $\mu \epsilon \tau \in ́ \chi$ оขтas.
26. каì $\sigma \phi i \sigma เ v$ aủtoìs к.т. $\lambda$. We expect the optative of $\beta$ oŋ $\theta \in i v$ in place of $\beta$ oŋ $\theta$ ouv $\boldsymbol{\nu} \epsilon \mathrm{s}$, but Aristotle continues the sentence as if $\chi \rho \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \nu 0 \iota \mu$ е́ $\nu \tau 0 \iota ~ \tau a i ̂ s ~ i o i ́ a t s ~ o i k i a \iota s ~ \tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ had preceded, and not



30. тоû $\mu$ ท̀ ả̉ıкєîv $\sigma$ фâs aủtoùs kaì тท̂s $\mu \in \tau \alpha \delta o ́ \sigma \in \omega s$ Xápıv. Tov̂
 dependent on коьшші́a.
 Nic. 10. 2. II73 a I3' (Eucken, De Partic. Usu, p. 10).

 the necessary conditions of a thing are not the thing (this is implied, for instance, in c. 5.1278 a 2 sq. and 4 (7). 8. 1328 a 21 sqq.). What is exactly meant by the phrase 'the communion of
households and families in living well'? It stands in opposition to
 several households and families do not live well singly, each within itself, but that they, as it were, throw their 'living well' into a common stock so that all share in it, and live well as members of a larger whole, the mó入ıs. The dative кai тaîs oiкiaıs каì тоis $\gamma \in \nu \in \sigma t$

 for instances of a similar dative. The módıs is not an union of single individuals but of oiкià and $\gamma^{\prime} \varphi \eta(=\kappa \omega ิ \mu a \iota)$ : cp. 1. $2.125^{2} \mathrm{~b}$ 27 sqq., 2. 5. 1264 a 5 sqq., and the closing sentences of the interpolation in Strabo, p. 419 , quoted above on 1278 big.

 realized without dwelling in the same place and intermarrying, or in

 together the households and $\gamma_{\epsilon \epsilon \nu \eta}$ of which the $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$ consists, and enable them to realize 'communion in good life.' The omission of any mention of the tribe is significant. It was probably too large, and at Athens too scattered, to be of much value as a means of тò $\sigma v \zeta \eta \bar{\eta} \nu$. There may well have been some who regarded $\tau \dot{o} \sigma \nu \zeta \check{\eta} \nu$ as the end of the State (cp. Eth. Eud. 7. 1. 1234 b 22, $\tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \epsilon$ jà $\rho$

 $\left.\dot{\alpha} \delta \iota \leqslant o v \mu \dot{́} \nu 0 v s \dot{\sim} \pi^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu\right)$ : hence the pains which Aristotle takes to point out that it is only a means to that end. Compare his language in c. 6.1278 b 20 sqq . and Eth. Nic. 8. II. II 60 a 19 ,


 єis ätavta ròv ßiov. There was a risk that the $\pi$ ò̀ts might be regarded as existing for the sake of pleasure like Eiaroı and є̈pavoı, or at any rate might be bracketed with marriage and the phratry as a means primarily to tò $\sigma v \zeta\lceil\hat{\eta} \nu$. Aristotle is all the more anxious to show that the end of the $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$ is not $\tau \grave{o} \sigma \nu \zeta \zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$ but rò $\epsilon \hat{v} \zeta \bar{\eta} \nu$, because he is thus enabled to draw the conclusion which he draws at the end of the chapter, that virtuous men have a claim to a larger share in the $\pi$ ódss than the rich or the é $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \epsilon \rho o t$. Just as Plato had spoken of festivals in Laws 653 D as a means by which men correct
and complete their education (cp. 828 A , where he takes up the subject of festivals for treatment immediately after that of education), so Aristotle regards affinities and phratries and sacrifices and ways of passing time pleasantly together as aiding in the realization of a 'communion in good life.' Another use of social ties of this kind was that they served to protect the individual from

 to this would not be to the point here. Compare the enumeration


 I take $\delta \omega a \gamma \omega \gamma a i$ rov̂ $\sigma \nu \bar{\zeta} \eta \mathrm{\nu} \nu$ to mean 'modes of passing time belonging to social life': cp. (with Bonitz, Ind. 7 เо a $3^{8}$ ) Eth. Nic. 4. 13 .

 rov̂ $\sigma v \zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu$, such as, for instance, solitary contemplation. I prefer this interpretation to those of Stahr ('Vereine für den Zweck heiterer Geselligkeit') and Bernays ('Belustigungen zur Beförderung des Zusammenlebens'), in which rov̀ $\sigma v \zeta \grave{\eta} \nu$ is taken to mean 'for the purpose of social life.' Common sacrifices and festivals were all the more necessary to ancient City-States, because their citizens usually dwelt scattered over the territory, and not concentrated in the city, like those of many mediaeval City-States.
38. rò סè tooûtov фi入ías épyov. The point of this remark, which is not at first sight evident, becomes so if we translate, 'but that which has just been mentioned' (i. e. rò $\sigma \nu \grave{\zeta} \grave{\nu} \nu$ ) 'is the business of friendship, [not the end of the $\pi$ ódscs] $^{\prime}$.
40. $\kappa \omega \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ is added in explanation of $\gamma \epsilon \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ (cp. 1. 2. 1252 b 16 sqq.).

1281 a.




8. ӧтᄂ $\mu$ èv oüv к.т.ג. Hávтes here means 'both,' as in 1280 a 9 , and $\mu$ épos rı tov̂ סıкaiov, 'only a part of what is just.' For the suppression of 'only' see below on 1282 a 36 .
11. "Exet $\delta$ ' äropíav к.т.д. So far the question discussed has C. 10. been who have the best claim to a superior share in the $\pi$ ódes, but
now Aristotle asks what the supreme authority of the State should be, for we have been told in c. 6.1278 b 8 sqq. that the nature of the constitution depends on the award made of supreme authority in the State. In the discussion which commences here Aristotle probably has before him Xen. Mem. 1. 2. 42 sqq., where Pericles is compelled by Alcibiades to admit that a law imposed by force whether by a tyrant, the few, or the many, is not law but lawlessness. Compare also Plutarch, Ad Princ. Inerudit. c. 4, oi $\pi a \lambda a t o i ̀$
 Diòs ка入ิิs $\delta v \nu a \mu$ évov.
12. For $\hat{\eta}$ ү ${ }^{\alpha} \rho$ тoı Eucken (De Partic. Usu, p. $7^{2}$ ) compares Phys. 8. 3. 254 a 18, adding that roı appears to belong to $\eta$, not to $\gamma$ áp.
 c. 14. 1285 a 2, c. 16.1287 a 1 I , and 6 (4). 1. 1288 b I5.
$\hat{\eta}$ túparvov. If we hold that the Good should be supreme, then we shall have to allow that the One Best should be supreme, and so again, if we hold that the rich should be supreme, we shall have to allow that the One Richest, or in other words a tyrant, should be

 ä $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ סíkauos $\mu$ о́vos).

 where also we have the emphatic order rav̂ra $\pi a ́ v \tau a$ ('every one of these things'). See critical note on 1282 a 40.
14. à $\nu$ of $\pi \epsilon \in \eta \tau \in S$ к.т. $\lambda$. Cp. 8 (6). 3. 13i 8 a 24 sqq. and Xen.
 answer to this question is given by a supporter of the supremacy of the Many-'No, for by Zeus it was justly decreed by the supreme authority'-to which Aristotle replies, 'Then what are we to say is the extreme of injustice, if not this ?' Dıkaiws, not 'with full legal validity' (as Sus. 'auf durchaus rechtsguiltige Weise'), but 'justly,' for what the supreme authority decides is ipso facto just. $\Delta$ ekaiws is severed from ésog , the word which it qualifies, for the sake of emphasis: see notes on 1255 a 2 I , 1265 b 15 , and 1323 a 36 , and Holden on Xen. Oecon. 2. S. Vict. and some others take т $\hat{\varphi}$ кирі $\varphi$ סıкa' $\omega$ s together ('summam potestatem habenti iuste'), but not, I think, rightly. N $\dot{\eta}$ $\Delta i ́ a$ occurs also in c. II 128 I b 18, but the Index Aristotelicus gives no other
instance from Aristotle's writings. In both these passages the expression is used asseveratively to introduce a statement which may be strongly affirmed.
 irrespective of wealth and poverty.' For $\pi$ ávr $\omega \nu \lambda \eta \phi \theta \in ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ see above on 1254 b 15, and cp. $\lambda^{2} \mu \beta a \nu \rho \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$, c. 13. 1283a 42. Bernays, followed by Susemihl, translates these words 'nachdem [den Reichen] Alles genommen worden,' but I cannot think that they are right. Mr. Welldon translates rightly, 'take the whole body of citizens.' Aristotle here, in fact, turns to consider the case of the Many despoiling the Few of their property, whether those Few are rich or poor.
 that destroys the thing which possesses it,' so that the measures of spoliation just referred to cannot be the outcome of virtue. Cp .

 Fab. Fragm. 12 (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 235),



 (c. 12. 1282 b 16), and 'the good of each thing preserves it' (2.2. 1261 b 9 : cp. Plato, Rep. 608 E sqq.).
21. kai тò̀ vóно⿱ тoûtov, i. e. the law by which supreme authority is given to the majority, no less than that by which supreme authority is given to the poor. So we read in c. 17. 1288 a 14,
 a depreciatory meaning is intended to be conveyed, as perhaps here, oiros is often placed by Aristotle after its substantive-e. g. in 2. 3. $1262 \mathrm{a} 13,2$. 6. 1265 b 16, 18, 1266 a I, 2. 9. 127 Ia I, 5 (8). 4. 1338 b 28 , and 6 (4). 9 . 1294 b 23 . But oṽ̃os is often placed after its substantive where this is not the case.
 for a tyrant was commonly regarded as the incarnation of injustice (4 (7). 2.1324 a 35 sqq. : Plato, Rep. 344 A).
 lutely ('rauben'), but Susemihl supplies rò̀ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os ('das Volk plündern'), and Bonitz (Ind. s. v.) đà ктínata тov̀ $\pi \lambda \hat{\lambda} \hat{\eta}^{\prime}$ ovs. I incline to follow Bonitz (see also Liddell and Scott), for Aristotle some-
times introduces a necessary word later than we expect: see for instance 5 (8). 3. 1337 b 3 I and 5 (8). 5. 1339 b I, where ovivaotau comes in late; also 2.6. 1264b 35 ( $\mu \in \tau \in ́ \chi о v \sigma \iota)$, 3. 6. 1279a 20 ( $\pi a ̂ \sigma a \iota$ ), 3. 8. 1279 b I5 ( $\tau_{\iota}$ ), and 1. 2. 1252 a 33 ( $\left.\phi \dot{v} \sigma \epsilon \iota\right)$.
28. тoùs ėmıєואєis, who will not plunder anybody. As to the danger arising from a mass of $\nexists \tau \iota \mu \circ \iota$ see note on 128 I b 28.
 Plato, Laws 713 E sqq., where States are advised to place themselves under the rule of law, since a god is no longer forthcoming,




 1286 a 16 sqq. Long before Plato, however, Pittacus had declared in favour of the rule of law (Diod. 9. 27.4: Diog. Laert. 1. 77). See below on 1286at.
36. ầv oûv к.т. $\lambda$. Plato had omitted to guard himself by explaining that the rule of law which he recommended must be the rule of good law. 'The Englishman in America will feel that this is slavery-that it is legal slavery, will be no compensation, either to his feelings or his understanding' (Burke, Speech on American Taxation: Works, ed. Bohn, r. 433). Burke goes still further elsewhere when he says that 'bad laws are the worst sort of tyranny.' Aristotle, however, finds in the Sixth Book (6 (4). cc. 4-5) and elsewhere a great difference between democracies or oligarchies in which law (i.e. democratic or oligarchical law) is supreme and those in which it is not.
C. 11. 40. öт $\delta \boldsymbol{\delta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ к.т. $\lambda$. $\Lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ has been translated in many different ways. Vict. translates $\delta o ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu \not a \nu \nu u ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ 'videretur solvi,' and Lamb. 'videatur esse expeditum ac solutum.' Bernays translates the words in what I take to be a similar way ('scheint sich befriedigend zu erledigen'). Bonitz appears to explain $\lambda \dot{v} \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ here as 'to be refuted' (which is also the rendering of Mr. Welldon), for in Ind. 439 a 20 sqq . he groups the passage before us with passages (Eth. Eud. 2. 8. 1224 b 6: Eth. Nic. 5. 15. I138 a 27 and 7. 13. II 53 a 29) in which the word bears this meaning, but, if we interpret $\lambda \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$ thus, it seems to be little in harmony with the words which follow immediately. Sus, translates 'gegen die angeregten Bedenken vertheidigen zu lassen' ('to be susceptible
of defence against the doubts raised about it '), but it is not easy to get this meaning out of the Greek, and he does not seem himself to be satisfied with his rendering, for he holds that the text is unsound in $\lambda \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a t-\bar{a} \lambda \dot{\lambda} \theta \in \epsilon a \nu$. If we retain $\lambda \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, I should be disposed to follow Vict. in his rendering of the word and to translate, 'but [the apparent paradox] that the Many ought rather to be supreme than the Few Best would appear to receive

 $\lambda_{\text {veor' à th taìra, where Bonitz explains ' diremptae sunt hae quaes- }}$ tiones,' and Grote, Aristotle, 2. 377, 'we may consider the problem as solved'). But there is some strangeness in ö́tı $\delta \hat{\epsilon} \delta \bar{\epsilon} \hat{\imath}$ к.т. $\lambda$. followed by $\lambda \dot{v} \epsilon \theta \theta a t$ in this sense, and I strongly suspect either that some word has dropped out before or after $\lambda \dot{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, such as $\delta \epsilon i \bar{\nu}$, or that $\lambda_{v} \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$ is corrupt. Perhaps we should read $\lambda_{\epsilon i \pi \epsilon \epsilon \theta a u \text { ('to re- }}$ main as a possible alternative') in place of it. The Few Best had found a panegyrist in Heraclitus (Fragm. II Bywater, ris yàp aủvồ


 cp. Eurip. Fragm. 358,

$$
\left(\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \lambda o \grave{v}_{s} \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega}\right)
$$


where $\epsilon \in \theta \lambda$ oùs $\epsilon$ ' $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { is added } e \text { conj., but probably rightly, by Hense, }\end{gathered}$
 $\hat{\eta} \tau \hat{\eta} s \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} s)$. But it is especially because Plato in the Republic had placed his ideal State in the hands of the Few Best (see Rep. 503 A sqq.) that Aristotle takes pains both here and in c. 13. $1283 \mathrm{~b} 20-35$ to show that if superior virtue gives a claim to political power, the Many have solid claims on that ground to such political power, at any rate, as they can exercise when gathered in an assembly and converted as it were into a single human being. We must not take him, however, to assert that a constitution in which the Few Best and a popular assembly of good type divide the powers of the State between them in this fashion is the best possible constitution ; on the contrary, the best constitution is that in which all the citizens are men of complete excellence ( $4(7) \cdot 13.133^{2}$ a $3^{2}$ sqq.: 6 (4) $7 \cdot 1293$ b x sqq.). His aim in the Eleventh Chapter, as in the Ninth, is in the main a negative and critical one-to overthrow the exclusive claims of the Few Best, just as in
the Ninth he overthrows the exclusive claims of the rich and the $\epsilon^{e} \lambda \in \dot{v} \theta \in \rho o u$.

42. kảv. 'Ipsum кả้ non sequente $\epsilon \grave{i}$ ita usurpatur ut a simplice kai vix distinguatur' (Bon. Ind. 41 a 36 , where instances of this are given).
toùs $\gamma$ à $\rho$ то $\lambda \lambda$ oús к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle here probably remembers Hom. II. 13. 237 ,

1281 b. 1. otroufaios àvท́p. See vol. i. p. 293.


 ėmıtєкєis, and in De Part. An. I. 5.645 a 7 sqq., in both which passages the opposition is of a similarly indirect character.
2. Ėкєivav, 'the Few Best.'
oủx ผ́s є̈кабтоv. Cp. 6 (4). 4. 1292 а 12.
oîov тג̀ $\sigma u \mu \phi о \rho \eta \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \delta \epsilon i \pi v \alpha ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ C р . ~ с . ~ I 5 . ~ 1286 ~ а ~ 29, ~ \tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~$
 722 sq.: St. Jerome, Epist. 26, c. 4.
 are, may have a share of virtue and prudence, and the Many, when they have come together, just as they become one man with many feet and many hands and many senses, may likewise become one man with many excellences of character and intelligence.' Supply

 have been used (it is the reading of some of the less good MSS.), see notes on 13 and 1335 b 19, and cp. De Gen. An. 2. 6. 744 a 15 sqq. and De Gen. et Corr. r. 4. 319 b rosqq. As to the gain of having many eyes, ears, hands, and feet, see c. 16.1287 b 26 sqq. The Lacedaemonians dedicated a statue of Apollo with four hands and four ears, as he had appeared to the combatants in a battle near Amyclae (Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. i. 22 : 2.264) ; the Erinnys is conceived by Sophocles (Electr. 488) as having many hands and feet; we read of beings like Geryon (see vol. i. p. 256 , note 5, and Stallbaum's note on Plato, Laws 795 C) ; and Aristotle imagines the same multiplicity extended to moral and intellectual gifts. He perhaps remembers in the passage before us Aristoph. Ran. 675 Didot,

 $\mu \nu р i a \iota ~ к a ́ \theta \eta \nu \tau a \iota$.
Compare also Eurip. Bacch. 359 Bothe ( 427 Dindorf), бофà̀ $\delta^{\circ}$ ảmє́ $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \pi \rho a \pi i \delta a ~ ф \rho \epsilon ́ v a ~ \tau \epsilon \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \sigma \omega ̂ \nu ~ \pi а р a ̀ ~ \phi \omega \tau \omega ิ \nu . ~$ тò $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s$ ö $\tau \iota$ тò фav入ótepov

and Xen. Cyrop. 4. 3. 21, where Chrysantas says that the mounted horseman gets the advantage of his horse's ears and eyes as well as his own, and thus comes to be something better than a centaur, for a centaur has only two eyes and two ears. The thought that the Many gathered in an assembly become, as it were, one man recurs in 6 (4). 4. I292 a II sqq. Plato had already (Rep. 493 A sqq.) compared the Many under these circumstances to a $\theta \rho \epsilon ́ \mu \mu a ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \gamma a ~ к a i ̀ ~ i \sigma \chi v \rho o ́ v, ~ b u t ~ h a d ~ r e g a r d e d ~ t h e ~ o p i n i o n s ~ o f ~ t h i s ~$ great creature, whether on questions of drawing, or music, or politics (493 D), as the reverse of wise, and the Sausage-seller in the Equites of Aristophanes ( $75^{2}$ sqq. Didot) finds the Athenian Demos far cleverer at home than in the Pnyx (cp. Demosth. Prooem. 14. p. 1427). On the other hand, bodies of men acting as a whole have sometimes been credited by good observers with a superiority to the individuals composing them taken singly. Thus 'Canning used to say that the House of Commons as a body had better taste than the man of best taste in it, and I am very much inclined to think that Canning was right' (Letter of Lord Macaulay, Feb. 1831: Life and Letters, r. 174). 'The quick and correct feeling of the House of Commons as a body is very striking' (Lord Stratford de Redcliffe in 1820: Life by S. Lane-Poole, 1. 294). The House of Commons, it is true, is a more or less picked assembly. Compare, however, also Plin. Epist. 7. I7. 10, opinor, quia in numero ipso est quoddam magnum conlatumque consilium, quibusque singulis iudicii parum, omnibus plurimum.
 and $\dot{\eta} \delta \iota a ́ v o u a$, which evidently repeats aj $\rho \in \tau \bar{\eta} s$ кaì $\phi \rho \circ \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega$, 4, Bonitz (Ind. 185 b 61) compares 5 (8). 2. 1337 a 38 sq.
 as a Whole these manifold excellences of character and intelligence) 'the Many [not only are better than the Few, but] also judge better both works of music and works of the poets.' Socrates was of a different opinion (Diog. Lacrt. 2. $4^{2}: 3 \cdot 5$ ), and Plato also (Rep.

 7oI B). Aristotle here (speaking to some extent aporetically) echoes the compliments which it was the fashion for comic pocts to shower on their audiences (Cratin. Inc. Fab. Fragm. 5I : Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 192),


10. $\mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ тоúт $\underset{\sim}{c}$ к.т. $\lambda_{.}$, 'but it is just in this that men of complete excellence differ from each individual of the Many.' I follow Vict. Giph. Bern. and Sus. in my rendering of סıaф́є́povaıv. Sepulv. Lamb. and Welldon render it 'are superior to,' but the former rendering suits 16 sq. and 19 sq. better. Plato had claimed (Rep. 484 sqq.: compare the picture drawn of Theaetetus in Theaet. 144 A sq.) that there was an union of many great qualities in the philosophic nature, and Aristotle says the same thing of the
 тoîs кa入oîs кà $\gamma \mathrm{a} \theta$ oîs $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ả $\nu \delta \rho \rho \hat{\nu} \nu$.
11. $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {., 'as }}$ indeed men say that beautiful persons differ from those who are not beautiful and pictures done by art from the original objects.' For other instances of the chiasmus which we note in $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \epsilon \rho, 1 \mathrm{I}-\dot{\alpha} \lambda \eta \theta \iota \nu \omega \nu, 12$, see note on 1277 a
 $\phi \dot{v} \sigma \in t$. Sus. ${ }^{2}$ (Note 566 : Sus. ${ }^{1}$, 1. p. 399) has already referred to the remark addressed by Socrates to Parrhasius in Xen. Mem. 3. ro. 2, and Vict. and Giph., followed by many others, to the mode in which Zeuxis obtained the ideal of womanly beauty which he depicted in his Helen. See Brunn, Geschichte der griech. Künstler 2. 80, 88 (referred to by Vahlen and Sus.), and Overbeck, Antiken Schriftquellen Nos. 1667-9, where Cic. De Invent. 2. I. 3 is quoted, tum Crotoniatae publico de consilio virgines unum in locum conduxerunt et pictori, quam vellet, eligendi potestatem dederunt. Ille autem quinque delegit ... Neque enim putavit omnia quae quaereret ad venustatem in corpore uno se reperire posse ideo quod nihil simplici in genere omnibus ex partibus perfectum natura expolivit.
 $\sigma v \nu \eta \gamma \mu \epsilon{ }^{\nu} a \operatorname{\epsilon is} \tilde{\epsilon} \nu$ ) 'to be separated from each other.' Here, as often elsewhere (see above on 1254 b 34), '̇nєi . . . $\gamma \epsilon$ 'justifies what precedes by pointing out what would result if the contrary were
the case.' As to the genitive absolute $\kappa \epsilon \chi \omega \rho / \sigma \mu \epsilon \ell \omega \nu$, see Bonitz on Metaph. A. 9.990 b I4, ขоєív $\tau \iota \phi \theta a \rho \notin ย \tau о$. 'Omissi in genitivis absolutis subiecti exempla ex Aristotele congessit Waitz ad Hermen. 10. 19 b 37, ex aliis scriptoribus Krüger, Gr. Gr. § 47. 4, 3. Usurpantur autem genitivi absoluti, cum per leges grammaticas videatur participium ad nomen quoddam ipsius enunciati primarii referendum fuisse (voeiv $\tau \iota \phi \theta a p e ́ v \tau o s$ idem quod voeiv $\tau \iota \phi \theta a p e ́ v$ ), quo maiore vi participium, seiunctum illud ab enunciatione primaria, pronuncietur, cf. Matthiae, Gr. Gr. §561, Krüger 1. 1. § 47.4, 2. Exempla Aristotelica contulit Waitz ad An. Pr. 2. 4.57 a 33.' Thus in the passage before us $\kappa \epsilon \chi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon \in \nu \nu$ might well have taken the place of $\kappa \in \chi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \hat{e} \nu \omega \nu$, and this reading is actually given by $\Gamma$ and in a blundered form by $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$, but $\kappa \epsilon \chi \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$ is certainly right. Waitz on De Interp. io. 19 b 37 compares among other passages Probl.
 $\chi \in \mu \hat{\omega} \nu o s:$ : see also Bon. Ind. I 49 b 37 sqq.
15. єỉ $\mu \in ิ ้ \nu$ oûv к., т. $\lambda$. Mèv oûv here introduces a slight qualification of what has been said (see above on $125^{2}$ b 27 sqq. and 1253 a 10) :

 passages in which the two words are used in much the same sense,
 tautological repetition is for the sake of emphasis (see notes on ${ }_{1323} \mathrm{~b}_{29}$ and $\mathrm{I}_{3} 25 \mathrm{~b}$ 10). Aristotle probably remembers a remark



18. For $\nu \grave{y}$ día see above on 128 I a I4.

ó yàp aủròs k. т. ${ }^{\text {., }}$ ' 'for [if we claimed that every kind of demos possesses this superiority over the Few Good,] the same argument would hold in the case of brutes also, [which is absurd:] and yet what difference is there, so to speak, between some kinds of demos and brutes?' Aristotle refers in évoo especially to cases in which the demos is composed of ßávavaot äyopaiot and $\theta_{\eta}$ tes, and is therefore
 and 8 (6).4. 1319 a 24 sqq.). The $\beta$ ávavoos and the On's $^{2}$ have been ranked with slaves in c. 4.1277 a 37 sqq ., and the slave comes very near to the brute (1. 5. 1254 b 24 sqq.). The Many had been compared to brutes by Heraclitus (Fragm. ini, quoted above on

I28I a 40), by Plato (Rep. 496 C sq.), and by Aristotle himself (Eth. Nic. I. 3. 1095 b 19 sq.).
 тои́тшу к.т. $\lambda$. The question referred to is that raised in c. 10.
 declared for a similar solution of the question (Areopag. § 26 , $\omega s$ s ${ }^{\circ}$





 кúpıov $\pi$ тoovorøs; ). Half the interest of the chapter before us lies in this, that in it Aristotle supports the views of Isocrates against those of his master Plato. There are no doubt some expressions in the passage just quoted of which Aristotle would not approve; he would also, it would seem, wish the magistracies to be in the hands of the Few Best rather than of oi $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ č $\gamma \in \iota \nu \delta \nu \nu a ́ \mu \in \nu o \iota ~ к a i ~ \beta i o \nu ~$
 he connects the $\epsilon \pi \iota \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \epsilon i s$ of 1282 a 26 with the possession of high property-qualifications.
 Vahlen on Poet. 24. 1459 b 7, where Eth. Nic. 6. I3. II 44 b 5, каi

 ' possess no ground of claim in respect of virtue,' cp. 2.5. 1264 b 8 sqq. and Plut. De Adulatore et Amico, c. $33, \mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \epsilon \chi \chi \nu$ á $\rho \epsilon \tau \bar{\eta} s$

25. тò $\mu \epsilon ิ v \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. If we supply $\phi \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ ä $\begin{gathered}\text { tıs } \epsilon i v a \iota ~ w i t h ~ o u ̉ k ~\end{gathered}$
 infinitives àòıkiv ä̀ (which Sus., following Rassow, would alter into $a \dot{\alpha} \iota \kappa \epsilon i \imath^{\nu} \dot{a} \nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta$ ) and $\dot{a} \mu a \rho \tau \alpha ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$. Aristotle is still expressing the views which the imaginary tis of 22 might entertain. See notes on 1259 a 39 and 1280 a 27 . Vahlen, Beiträge zu Aristot. Poet. r. 5r, explains these infinitives as 'dependent on the thought contained in what precedes,' and refers to Waitz on Hermen. 19 a 23. The strong language here used as to the áфporviv and áoıkia of the Many as individuals recalls the language of the Persian Megabyzus in Hdt. 3 . 81, ó $\mu i \lambda$ ov $\gamma$ à $\rho$ àxp that of Plato in Rep. 496 C sq., where $\mu a v i a$ and àosia are ascribed
to them ; Aristotle himself, if he were expressing his own views, would perhaps use milder terms.
 with $\mu \epsilon \tau a \delta ̊ \iota \delta o ́ v a \iota ~ a n d ~ \mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, and єivat with $\phi \circ \beta \epsilon \rho o ́ v$. For the risks attending the presence in a Greek State of many ürıцо see [Xen.] Rep. Ath. 3. 12 sq. and Plut. Ages. c. 30. Cp. also 2. 12.1274 a




 in the passage before us probably means 'judging,' but as Aristotle is speaking of functions exercised by the whole demos gathered in one assembly, and not broken up into a number of dicasteries, he must refer to the judicial functions which fell to the popular assembly ( 6 (4). 14. I 298 a 3 sqq.). When the holders of magistracies


 the only remaining course is to give them rights of deliberating and judging, Aristotle forgets that it would be possible to admit them to minor offices, a course suggested by him under certain circumstances in 7 (5). 8. 1309a 27 sqq. and 8 (6). 5. 1320b if sqq.
 c. 18. As Solon gave the assembly no more power than this, it is difficult to understand why he took the trouble to institute a Boulê of 400 to aid it in the performance of these light duties. Aristotle points out in 7 (5).6. 1305 b 30 sqq. the risks besetting oligarchies in
 the Solonian constitution exposed to similar risks? Contrast with Solon's policy that of the founder or founders of the Lacedaemonian Ephorate; this great office was made accessible to all the citizens. It is possible that Solon legislated on this subject in intentional opposition to them. The passage before us reads as if Solon was the first to give the right of electing magistrates to $\tau \grave{~} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{o s} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ at Athens. If this is Aristotle's meaning, we must suppose that in 2.12 .1273 b 4 I sqq., where he says that Solon found the magistrates already appointed by election, he means that, though they were thus appointed before Solon's time,
they were not elected by the people. On the question whether Aristotle's statements as to Solon here and in 1282 a 25 sqq. and 2. 12. 1274 a 15 sqq. are reconcilable with ' $A \theta . \Pi o \lambda . c .8$, ràs $\delta^{\prime}$


 Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 136. r) and Busolt (Gr. Gesch., ed. 2, 2. $275^{\circ}$. I) take opposite views, the former thinking that they are and the latter that they are not. To me the latter view seems to be the true one.
 his ideal State the right of electing the magistrates (2. 8. 1268a II), but (so Aristotle thinks) excluded the cultivators and artisans from the most important offices ( 1268 a 20 sqq .). In some oligarchies the demos, though excluded from office, had the right of electing the magistrates ( 7 (5). 6.1305 b 30 sqq.).


 speaks here as if to give the Many the right of electing the magistrates was equivalent to giving them deliberative authority; he distinguishes the two things, however, in 8 (6). 4. I 3 I 8 b 23 sqq. As to $\epsilon \pi i \tau \epsilon \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. see note on 1284 a 35 .
34. кatà hóvas. See vol. i. p. 257 , note 2 , and cp . Plato, Polit. 292 B , катà $\pi \rho \dot{\tau} \tau a s$. The expression probably includes magistracies administered by Boards in addition to those held by single individuals.
 1275 a 32.

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \grave{\alpha}$ тov̂ $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{o v s}$. Dr. Arnold has already compared the passage before us with Thuc. 6. 18.6, where Alcibiades says, каi роцібатє

 also above on 1276 b 37.
 standing in need of some further working-up to fit it for consumption, is termed 'impure food' in De Gen. An. 1. 20. 728 a 26, Є̈ $\sigma \tau$

 by Aubert and Wimmer,' sifted through,' from סıatтá $\omega$ ), ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \in \sigma \tau \iota \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$




 $\lambda$ ióкєтаи. In Athen. Deipn. 109 с а каӨapòs äpros, or 'loaf of pure
 'unsifted ') 'meal,' and in Hippocr. De Victus Ratione (vol. i. p. 673 Kühn) каӨapà ả̉єvpa are opposed to $\sigma v \gamma \kappa о \mu \tau \sigma \tau a ̀ ~ a ̉ \lambda \epsilon v \rho a . ~$ Aristotle evidently thinks that a large quantity of pure and impure food together is more nutritious than a smaller quantity of pure food. He was much interested in questions about diet (Plut. Alex.




 and answered by ä $\lambda \lambda \eta \delta^{\circ} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i \nu \dot{\epsilon} \notin о \mu \epsilon ́ v \eta ~ \tau a u ́ \tau \eta s, 24$. Compare with this ámopia the remark ascribed to Anacharsis in Plut. Solon, c. 5

 argument ascribed to him in Sext. Empir. Adv. Math. 7. 55-59.

 траи́датоs from Anon. ap. Suid. s. v. ívıa $\theta \in i$ is.
42. oûtos $\delta^{3}$ értiv iatpós. $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ add $\dot{o}$ before iarpós, but probably wrongly: see above on 1253 b II and cp.c. 4 .
 Bon. Ind. 546 a $5^{1}$ sqq.
ópoíms $\delta$ è тои̂то к.т. $\lambda$. We must apparently supply ${ }^{\prime \prime} \chi \in \epsilon$. For similar omissions of $\epsilon \notin \epsilon \iota$ see Bon. Ind. 306 a 16 sqq.
 The two words are conjoined also in 1. 9. 1257 a 4 and 8 (6). 2. 1317 b 21 .
3. Laтpòs $\delta$ è k. т. $\lambda$., ' and we give the name of physician to the executant, and to the man of directing skill, and thirdly to the man who is merely cultivated in the science.' For the contrast of


 in Metaph. A. I. 98 I a 30 sqq. and b 3 I sq. with the $\chi \in \iota \rho о \tau \in ́ \chi \nu \eta$ s. As



 Bonitz (Ind. 558a 4), De Part. An. I. 1. 639 a $1, \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu ~ \theta \epsilon \omega \rho i a \nu$




4. єi̛oi $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. See critical note on 1282 a 5 .
7. Tク̀v aipecıv, 'the election' of magistrates and other masters of an art, as well as the review of their conduct.
 less than judging rightly] is the work of those who know the particular science or art.' The force of каi is here retained in каi ráp. Compare the remarks of Cicero in Pro Plancio 3.7 and 4.9.
10. $\epsilon i$ ү $\dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda .$, ' for if in the case of some kinds of work and some arts some non-scientific persons also do share in the ability to make a good choice, they do not do so in a higher degree than the
 by Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, would read ov̉ $\tau o \iota$ in place of oű $\tau \iota$, but oű $\tau \iota$ seems to be right here: see Eucken, De Partic. Usu, p. 70, who remarks, 'hoc videtur praemittendum esse, oӥтo ita distare ab oürı, ut illud sententiam restringi significet, cum $\tau i ̀$ ad oủ addito nihil aliud nisi particulae negantis vis prematur.' See also Bon. Ind. 539 b 18 sqq. The passage before us was perhaps present to the memory of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in De Thucyd. iud. 4,





 Laws (701 A) which Aristotle probably has before him here Plato had said that the $\theta$ єатоократia which sprang up at Athens after the Persian War would have mattered less if the demos had consisted


18．$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ Ėvícy，Sc．$\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \omega ิ \nu$ ．Aristotle would not say this of geometry，for instance．
$\mu$ óvov ó moıク́бas．See critical note．






 Yet if the user is a better judge of the excellence of some articles than the maker，it does not follow that some users are not better judges than others．
 see vol．i．p． $25^{88}$ ，note 1．Cp．also Alexis，Fragm．ムívos（Meineke， Fragm．Com．Gr．3．444），



 sqq．：see vol．i．p． $25^{8 .}$

26．ai $\delta^{\prime}$ єüӨuval к．т．$\lambda$ ．Cp． 8 （6）．2．1317 b 25，тò $\delta \iota k a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$
 $\mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau \omega \nu$ каì $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ кvpı$\iota \tau a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ，ồo $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \epsilon v ̉ \theta \nu \nu \omega ิ \nu ~ к . \tau . \lambda$ ．

27．$ั \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ єi้ $\eta \tau \alpha \iota$ ，in 128 I b 32 ．

29．каitol к．т．$\lambda_{\text {．introduces a proof that members of the assem－}}$ bly，etc．，are фaî̀or（26）．So much mixed up is the conception of фjau入órךs and éтเєiкєєa with wealth and poverty．It is here implied that the Boulê is not one of ai $\mu^{\prime} \gamma \iota \tau \tau a \iota$ ápxaí，whereas in 8 （6）．8．1322 a $30-\mathrm{bI} 7$ it is grouped with the offices of stratêgus and euthynus and logistês and counted among the most important magistracies． Notwithstanding what is said here，a high property－qualification was sometimes required for membership of the assembly，and sometimes none at all（6（4）．9． 1294 b 3 sq．）．At Athens no one could be a member of the Boulê or the Heliaea till he was thirty years of age（Gilbert，Const．Antiq．of Sparta and Athens，Eng． Trans．，pp．265，392），but Aristotle would perhaps regard this as



 'A $\begin{aligned} & \text { nuâs to be Pentacosiomedimni, and the law was the same in }\end{aligned}$ Aristotle's day, but it was no longer observed ('A A. Под. c. 47 init.: c. 7 sub fin.: c. 8. 1. 7). It does not appear that there was any property-qualification for the office of stratêgus at Athens, for the stratêgi are said to be elected 'from all' (Gilbert, ibid. p. 230).
33. кaì $\tau \alpha u$ û', i. e. the giving of greater powers to men possessed of a small property-qualification only and youthful in years than to men possessed of a high property-qualification, no less than the giving to unskilled persons of the right to elect magistrates and to review their conduct in office.
36. $\mu$ ópıóv évтı тоútwv, 'is only a part of these.' For the suppression of 'only' cp. c. 9. 1281 a 9, c. 11. 1282 b 4, and c. 15. 1286 b 8, and see notes on 1336 b 26, 1340 a 34, and 1292 a 32.
$\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \omega$ סè $\mu$ ópıov к.т. $\lambda$. This explanation seems unnecessary, but see above on 1277 b 37 and below on 1282 b 39. See also Vahlen on Poet. I3. 1453 a 4.
40. $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \omega v$ тoút $\omega v$, i.e. the members of the demos, the Boulê, and the dicastery.



 discussion has made it clear that the check of law is necessary to prevent the Many or the Few committing injustice, and that law must be just law if it is to do this.
4. $\pi \epsilon p i ̀ ~ \tau о u ́ \tau \omega \nu$, 'only about those things' (see above on 1282 a 36 ).


8. ${ }_{\alpha}^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda .$, 'but it must needs be also that as the constitutions [to which laws belong] are bad or good and just or unjust, so the laws also are the same-this, however, is clear that the laws must be adjusted to the constitution, [not the constitution to the laws]-but if this is so, it is evident that laws in accordance with the normal constitutions must necessarily be just and laws in accordance with the deviation-forms not just.' For the view that laws vary with constitutions, cp. Plato, Laws 714 B sq. Cp. also 6 (4). 1. 1289 a 13 , $\pi \rho$ òs 耳ùp tàs $\pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i ́ a s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~$


ขóuous. Demosthenes insists on this also : see Hug, Studien aus dem classischen Alterthum, p. 79, where Demosth. c. Androt. c. 30



 cc. 105-109, where the variation of the laws respecting rewards under different constitutions is traced. Sus. has already referred




14 sqq. Aristotle's inquiries have so far led him to the conclu- C.12. sion that the true supreme authority is to be found in 'laws in accordance with the normal constitutions,' and we expect him (see vol. i. p. 259) to go on and ask what laws are in accordance with the normal constitutions, but perhaps he feels that he has not yet sufficiently studied how normal or just constitutions should be organized, and that till he has done this he cannot decide what laws are in accordance with them. At all events, instead of asking this question, he makes a new start in the Twelfth Chapter and learns from a renewed inquiry into the nature of Political Justice, ( $\mathbf{r}$ ) that a just or normal constitution will recognize in its distribution of power all attributes which contribute to the being and well-being of the State, and not one of them only, and (2) that under given circumstances the conclusion at which he has arrived in favour of the supremacy of law does not hold good, and that Justice may require that the State shall be ruled not by law, but by the will of an Absolute King supreme over all law. To this extent then the conclusion reached at the end of c . II needs to be modified. In teaching that account ought to be taken of other things besides virtue in the award of political power, and that superiority in virtue alone, unless it is transcendent, gives no just claim to exclusive political supremacy, Aristotle differs from the language held by Plato in Laws $756 \mathrm{E}-758 \mathrm{~A}$, and especially 757 C , where we read of the nobler of the two kinds of
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${ }^{\prime} E \pi \epsilon \iota$ §è к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Here begins a long string of protases introduced by $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i$, which lack an expressed apodosis to take them up: compare 1. I2. 1259 a 37 sqq. The virtual apodosis perhaps comes
 'we shall do well to inquire what the just is.' Compare Magn.

 on Plato, Hipp. Maj. 293 E. For $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ see note on $125^{2}$ a 4.




 $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \eta$ vel pro synonymo usurpatur' (Bon. Ind. 207 b 4 sqq.). The three terms are already used in conjunction by Isocrates in Panath.

 which is for the common advantage.' Cp. 1. 9. 1257 a 19 , $\epsilon^{\epsilon} \nu \quad \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$
 because he has already explained in c. 6 that the common advantage is the end for which the State originally comes into being and the end of all normal constitutions: cp. Eth. Nic. 8. II. II6o a II sqq. and Rhet. 1. 6. 1362 b 27 sq.
 (where see note). By 'ıбov $\tau \iota$ is probably meant "tَov кат' àvàoyiav:
 àva入oyià "' $\sigma o \nu$.
 The reference appears to be to Eth. Nic. 5. 6. II 3 r a 9 sqq. Popular opinion is distinguished from 'philosophical inquiries' very





20. тì үàp кaì tıoi tò Síkatov, 'for that which is just is a thing and has to do with persons,' or, in other words, justice involves an assignment of a thing to persons.
 inquiry is productive of questions and of philosophical speculation on politics.' For ${ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\chi} \chi \epsilon \iota$ see above on 1268 b 24 . It is a merit in inquiries to give rise to aporetic discussion : see above on 1275 b 34. Bonitz (Ind. 820 b 58 sqq.) compares Phys. I. 2. 185 a 17 ,





 him the discussion in Plato, Gorg. 490 B sqq. He may possibly have thought that Plato lent some countenance to the view criticized by him when he said of true Justice in Laws 757 C , $\tau \hat{\imath}$
 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ a u ̀ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \phi \dot{v} \sigma \iota \nu$ éкатє́ $\rho \omega$, yet it is likely that Plato's language in

 the distinction between attributes contributing to the work to be done and others. See also below on 27 .
24. $\nu \in \nu \epsilon \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$, not $\nu \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ : cp. 4 (7). 9. 1329 а 16: 4 (7). 12.

 'Saepe quidem in physicis maxime metaphysicisque libris cum aliorum verborum tum huius ipsius ákoдovөєiv formae praeteriti ponuntur vix ut praeteriti temporis notionem persentias, velut ut huius quidem verbi exempla pauca ponam, тav́тŋ $\delta^{\circ}$ $\eta$ колоú $\theta \eta \kappa є$ ( $\tau \hat{\eta}$
 रàp $\tilde{\lambda} \eta \eta s \sigma^{\sigma} \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$, De Part. An. 2. 1. 647 a $34^{\prime}$ (Vahlen on Poet. 5. 1449 b 9).
 'abundantia contraria copulandi,' see Vahlen on Poet. 1. 1447 a 17 , who refers among other passages to Pol. 5 (8). 5. I340 a 4 I , ä $\lambda \lambda \omega$ s

 explanation of tò sikatov (see note on 1257 b 7 ) and to show that the kind of tò סikatov referred to is that which rests on $\dot{a} \xi i a$, for
there is another kind of tò Sikatov (8 (6). 2. 1317 b 3, кaì үà $\rho$ тò
 That this kind alone is truly just we see from 4 (7).9. 1329 a 16 ,


27. $\alpha \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta \grave{\eta}^{\nu}$ к.т. $\lambda$. In correcting this error (cp. 1283 a 11-14) Aristotle probably has before him a saying of Solon (Diod. 9. 2. 5,


 $\lambda$ árт $\epsilon \nu)$, a saying which Xenophanes virtually repeats in the wellknown lines (Fragm. 2. Bergk),
 oűt' єi $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau a \theta \lambda \epsilon i \nu$, oüтє $\pi a \lambda a \iota \sigma \mu \circ \sigma v ́ \nu \eta \nu$,




 oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ тıaiveı тavิтa $\mu \nu \chi o u ̀ s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega s$

(cp. Isocr. Paneg. § I sq.). Plato had lent some momentary countenance to the opposite view in Laws 744 B (see vol. i. p. 260, note r ), but he anticipates Aristotle in Laws 696 B , oú $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ $\delta \dot{\eta} \eta \delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$

 $\sigma \omega \phi$ рorv́v $\grave{\pi} \eta \hat{\eta}$ (where he perhaps remembers the saying of Solon and the lines of Xenophanes), except that Aristotle thinks that the rich man has a better claim to office than the swift or handsome or strong man. The Ethiopians were said to make the biggest and strongest man among them their king (Hdt. 3. 20 : Pol. 6 (4). 4. 1290 b 4 sqq .) or else the handsomest (Athen. Deipn. 566 c : Nic. Damasc. Fragm. 142 in Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 3. 463), other barbarians honoured swiftness of foot in the same way (Nic. Damasc. Fragm. 138 : Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. ibid.), and Euripides had put in the mouth of one of his characters the lines (Fragm. 1035),
$\hat{\eta}$ róga $\pi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ท̂ $\mu a ́ \chi \eta$ §opòs $\sigma \theta e ́ v \omega \nu$,

Indeed, Aristotle himself speaks in 1. 5. 1254 b 34 sqq. and 4 (7).

14．I $33^{2}$ b 16 sqq．as if a great physical superiority conferred a title to rule．



31．Tิ̂v $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \dot{\rho} \mu^{\prime} \dot{i} \omega \nu$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．Aristotle first takes the case in which the essential attribute（skill in flute－playing，in the illustrative parallel which he has chosen）is shared by several individuals in an equal degree，and he says that these individuals must be awarded flutes of equal excellence；extraneous qualifications like that of high birth must not be allowed to turn the scale in favour

 He next passes on（ 34 sqq．）to the case in which one individual possesses the essential attribute in a far higher degree than the rest，and as to this case he tells us that no inferiority of this indi－ vidual in respect of higher but non－essential things must lead us to deny him the superior award of flutes which is his due．


 8，$\mu$ ккро̀̀ $\pi \rho \circ a \gamma a \gamma o ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \tau o ̀ ̀ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu . ~$

38．єỉ кai $\mu \in i\} o \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．How little respect was felt for the art of flute－playing，we see from 5 （8）．6．I34I a 18 sqq．
 （see Vahlen＇s note on this passage ：he says＇éxá⿱宀тou hic ut alibi est pro ékaréfov＇and refers to his Aristot．Aufsätze，2．50）．

39．$\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$ бè к．т．$\lambda$ ．For this really needless explanation see above on 1277 b 37 and 1282 a 36 ．
katà Tŋ̀v dava入oyiav，＇if we compare the two ratios，＇i．e．the ratio in which noble birth and beauty excel the art of flute－playing and the ratio in which the surpassing flute－player excels his fellows．



2．In place of toû $\pi \lambda$ дoútou we expect tov̂ кá入入ous，but see below 1283 a． on 1323 b 35 ．
 imagined opponent in 1282 b 23 sqq．Things that differ very much are not commensurable（Eth．Nic．5．8． $1133 \mathrm{~b} 18, \tau \hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ oủv


 249 a 3 sqq.).
4. $\epsilon \grave{i} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ tò $\tau \grave{\imath} \mu^{\prime} \hat{\gamma} \epsilon \theta$ os. Montecatino (vol. iii. p. 191) translates, 'si magis imperiorum et principatus civitatis esse particeps debet,' etc., and so Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 'for if a given bodily stature [confers political privileges] more [than a certain amount of wealth or good birth].' These interpreters apparently supply $\delta \in i ̂ \mu \epsilon \tau \in ́ \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ả $\rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu$, or something similar, with $\mu \hat{a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~(c p . ~} 1282$ b 23 sqq.). Stahr, on the other hand, translates, 'denn wenn eine bestimmte Körpergrösse für irgend etwas höheren Werth verliehe (confers a higher value for anything whatever),' and Bernays, 'denn wenn z. B. einem gewissen Maass von Körpergrösse im Vergleich zu Reichthum und freier Geburt irgend etwas in höherem Grade zukommt.' Prof. Ridgeway brackets $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$, and another critic would read $\dot{\epsilon} \nu a ́ \mu \nu \lambda \lambda_{o \nu}$ in place of it, and Sus. ${ }^{4}$ mentions these suggestions, though he still retains $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ in his text. I am myself inclined to supply $\dot{\alpha} \gamma a \theta_{o} \nu$ with $\mu \hat{\mu} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ from the preceding sentence ('more a good'), and to translate, 'for if a given amount of size is more a good than [a given amount of some other good, such as wealth or free birth].'

каì ö $\lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$ ầ к.т. $\lambda$. ., 'size would also generally' (i.e. apart from its amount) 'be capable of being matched against wealth and free birth.'
6. $\check{\omega} \sigma \tau^{\prime} \in \mathfrak{i}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text {., 'and }}$ so, if this man excels in size more than this man in virtue' (or in other words, if this man's amount of size is superior to this man's amount of virtue), 'and size generally' (i. e. apart from questions of amount) 'is superior in a higher degree than virtue, everything would be comparable [whatever its amount], for if such an amount is better than such an amount, such an amount will evidently be equal.' I have followed Sus. in bracketing $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\gamma} \epsilon \theta$ os, 8 , which may have been repeated by mistake from the preceding line, though it is possible that instead of bracketing $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \gamma \epsilon \theta$ os we should read ajqaOóv in place of it. The difficulty of retaining $\mu^{\prime} \gamma \epsilon \theta$ os arises from this, that, if we do so, we have to translate, 'for if such an amount of size is better than such an amount [of something else], such an amount will evidently be equal,' and it is doubtful whether we have any right to supply 'of something else.' Aristotle probably means by єĭ áv $\sigma v \mu \beta \lambda \eta \tau a ̀$ mávea, 8 , that all goods would be comparable, not everything, for this








11. $\epsilon \mathfrak{l} \gamma \grave{a} \rho$. . . 14. $\tau \eta \geqslant \tau \tau \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$. Here the fragment of Xenophanes quoted in part above on 1282 b 27 is especially present to Aristotle's mind. Oúס̇́v is to be taken with $\delta \in i ̂$, as in Eth. Nic. 9. ro. II70 b ${ }^{2} 7$, où $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ oủv $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ aủt $\omega \nu$. Tì̀ $\tau \tau \mu \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$, 'the honour which falls to them.'
13. ทं тоúт $\omega \nu$ סıaфорá, 'the superiority possessed by these men.'
14. $\mathfrak{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\epsilon} \xi \xi$ ஸ̂v к. т. $\lambda$. 'E $\nu$ тоúrots is 'in respect of these things':




 regarded by Aristotle as composed of wealth, free birth, nobility,



16. $\tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{S} \tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{cp} . \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \iota \mu \dot{\eta} \nu, \mathrm{I} 4$, which answers to $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\omega} \nu, \mathrm{II}$.
17. $\delta \in \hat{\imath} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. ., '[for free birth and wealth are things of which the $\pi 0^{\prime} \lambda$ is is composed,] for' etc. Cp. Eurip. Fragm. 2 I (quoted above on 1276 b 37). In 6 (4). 4. I291 a 33 Aristotle mentions tò raîs
 It is true that in Crete the State defrayed the liturgies which were elsewhere borne by rich men (see above on 1272 a 17 ), and that this might have been made the general rule, but even then rich men would be needed to contribute to the eisphora. Aristotle says nothing about oi eijgeveis, though he has mentioned them in 16 ,


тíл $\eta \mu \alpha$ фє́portas, i.e. contributing to the State a rateable quota

 For the contrast implied here between oi äтороь and oi тí $\eta \mu a$ фє́ $о \nu \tau \epsilon s$, see note on 1279 b 19 .
18. oủ үà $\rho$ âv єï к.т. $\lambda$. See above on 1276 b 37 and 1280 a 32. Is there a tacit reference here to the latter passage, in which it was
shown that there could not be a $\pi$ onts wholly composed of slaves? If so, we have something to add to the other evidence (see vol. i . Appendix C) that cc. 12 and 13 were placed where they stand by Aristotle.
19. ${ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Cp. 6 (4). 4. 1291 a 24 sqq. (where military prowess and judicial virtue are again mentioned together) and 4 (7). I5. 1334a 18 sqq. Tyrtaeus had long ago said (Fragm. 12. 15 ),
$\nu \omega \lambda \epsilon \mu \epsilon \in \omega s$ к. $\boldsymbol{\tau} . \lambda .$,
and as to justice Protagoras had gone farther than Aristotle, for he makes it essential to the very existence of a State (Plato, Protag.


21. $\pi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. For the contrast here drawn between $\epsilon_{i v a l}^{i v o} \mathrm{~m}_{\imath} \iota$


 1. $8.125^{6} \mathrm{~b}^{2}$, and said to be the end which the lawgiver should set before him in 4 (7). 2. $13^{2} 5^{\text {a }} 7$ sqq. Пaıò́ía and àpecín are here conjoined as in Plato, Laws 757 C, and in 6 (4). 4. 1291 b 29 and 6 (4). II. 1295 a 26 sqq. Haióeia, ' culture,' is connected with aristocracy in 6 (4). 15.1299 b 24 sq., where the offices in an aristocracy, which are usually said to be filled $\epsilon_{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \omega ิ \nu$ ápícтov (3. 7. 1279 a 35),
 it is opposed to $\beta$ avavoia and treated as a note of oligarchy (cp. 6 (4). 8. 1293 b 37). Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective,
 however that $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta \tau o i \eta \nu$ occurs in Plato, Euthyd. 296 E, and

 1323 a 24 and 5 (8). I. 1337 a 12.
26. каӨáтєр є"рךта⿱ каì тро́тєроv, in c. 9. 1281 a 4 sqq.
èmè $\delta \mathbf{\varepsilon}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. This has been already said in substance in c. 9 . 1280 a 21 sqq ., and it is repeated in 7 (5). 1. 1301 a 25 sqq . For $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ "'vov " 'xєtv, 'to have an equal share with others of everything,'
 and Eurip. Phoeniss. $5^{13}$ Bothe, 547 Dindorf, $\sigma \grave{v} \delta^{\prime}$ oùk àvéget $\delta \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ éx $\chi \omega \nu$ ücov;

Tàs tolaúras mo入ıreias, i. e. constitutions which give an equal amount of everything to those who are equal in one thing only, or which give an unequal amount of everything to those who are unequal in one thing only. The reason why such constitutions must necessarily
 I 7 sqq.).
 1280 a 9 sqq . Mèv oủv has nothing to answer to it. Aristotle's original intention probably was, after interposing an explanation of the grounds on which the different claimants base their claims, to
 äp $\chi \in \iota \nu \delta \in \hat{\iota}$. In adding this explanation, however, he allows his attention to be diverted and the strict sequence of the passage to be broken (just as in I. 12. 1259 a 37 sqq.), and thus it happens that $\mu \dot{\mu} \nu$ oủv has nothing to answer to it. Mèv oûv here, as elsewhere, introduces a more particular and detailed treatment of the subject.


 пáбats хрךбтéov.
31. oi $\pi \lambda$ oúvเot $\mu$ èv к.т. $\lambda$. In the passage $3^{1}-42$ Aristotle bears in mind the rule which he has laid down in c. 12.1283 a 14 sq. that claimants for political power must rest their claims on attributes entering into the composition of a State. The different claimants are represented as doing so. This is indicated by коьцóv (32), $\pi$ ро̀s

 or in other words, one of the things which are essential to the State: cp. 4 (7). 4. 1326 a 5 sqq. Compare also Eth. Nic. 8. I6.

 $\epsilon \dot{\nu} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \tau \cup \hat{\nu} \nu \tau,, \dot{\eta} \tau \iota \mu \eta \dot{\delta} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ коьขóv. It is implied in the passage before us that the rich will be owners of land, and this may have commonly been the case in Greece; still there were other forms of wealth besides wealth in land (2.7.1267 b 10 sqq.), and most of Nicias' wealth was in silver (Plut. Nic. c. 4).
32. ${ }^{\text {Étı к. к. } \boldsymbol{\lambda} \text {. So the Syracusan Athenagoras, though he was }}$ the leader of the demos, admits that the rich are the best custodians of money (Thuc. 6.39) : that this was a common view we see from

 and Pol. 6 (4). 8. 1293 b 38 sqq. and 2. 11. 1273 a 21 sqq. (cp. also Fragm. Trag. Adesp. $9^{2}$ Nauck). Aristotle does not agree with this view; he requires virtue in a custodian of money ( $7(5) .9$. r 309 b 6 sqq.).
 noble claim as not being far from each other, inasmuch as [if the free-born claim on the strength of their citizenship,] those who are better born are citizens in a higher degree than the low-born, and nobility is in every State locally prized; and again because it is likely that those descended from better ancestors will be better, seeing that nobility is excellence of race.' The ' $\bar{\lambda} \in \dot{\epsilon} \theta \in \rho o t$ and the

 in a positive degree (cp. 1283 b 19 sq.). In some places the word è $\lambda \in \dot{\prime} \theta \epsilon \rho \frac{1}{}$ appears to have been used to designate the noble (6 (4). 4 .

 citizens in a higher degree than the low-born, for they could reckon more generations of citizen descent, and this was with many a test of citizenship (c. 2. 1275 b 2 I sqq.). The fact that nobility is $\pi a \rho$ '

 claim. Its champions might have gone further and urged that Greek nobility is recognized everywhere (1. 6. 1255 a 32 sqq.), but this would not have been equally to the point. The sophist Lycophron would not admit that nobility belonged to the class of
 form timos is used in the passage before us (possibly because it is followed by $\begin{gathered} \\ \epsilon\end{gathered}$ : see note on 1277 b ${ }^{25}$ ): in De Part. An. 1. 5 .


 тоtoùrov єîval. For the definition of évýveta as àpetì yévous cp . Rhet.








 'excellence of race ' in the sense that the race to which the $\epsilon$ i $\gamma \in v \eta_{n} s$ belongs has produced in the past a number of virtuous men ( cp .
 eivevin's stands at any rate a better chance of being virtuous than one who is not eivevi's. We must bear in mind that this definition of eivéveca is here placed in the mouth of oi eneívepot kai eiveveis, who would be likely to take the most favourable view of éry'veia. We see from Rhet. I. 5. 13 30 ob 34 that eivévela did not, in the ordinary acceptation of the word, necessarily imply descent from ancestors remarkable for virtue; it might imply only descent from ancestors remarkable for wealth or other social advantages; nor did it necessarily imply a frequent occurrence in the family of virtuous individuals, but only of individuals distinguished in some way or other (ėmı申aveis). Cp. Diog. Laert. 3. 88. Still the view that eivéveca is áperो̀ yévous is not far from that of Aristotle. In the Rhetoric ( 2.15 . 1390 b 22 sqq .), as we have seen, it is distinctly adopted by him, though he holds that, owing to the occurrence from time to time of degeneracy in families, most eiरeveis are men of little worth. Compare the view taken in the fragments of the possibly genuine חє $\overline{\text { ì }}$ єंvevetias (Aristot. Fragm. $82-85.1490$ a 1 sqq .). Here, however, we find ( 1490 a 3 r sqq.) a reference to the contention that oi ék mádaı $\pi$ गoovícv may be

 Aristotle seems to adopt as his own the doctrine that eijéveta implies descent from ancestors not only virtuous but rich (6 (4).
 i 301 b 3 ).
37. ©́poíws $\delta$ خ̀ к.т.ג., 'we shall say then that in a similar way virtue also prefers a just claim, for we say that justice, which is necessarily accompanied by all the other virtues, is virtue operative in social relations [and therefore essential to the State: so that virtue as a whole has as good a claim to recognition as justice].' I take the
 omission of äpetás after tàs ä̀ $\lambda$ als, cp. 1. 13. 1260 a $24: 3.5$. 1278 a 40 . Aristotle introduces his own view with $8 \dot{\eta}$, just as he introduces it with ov̉y in c. $3.127^{6}$ a 13 sqq . For $\boldsymbol{\delta} \mu \boldsymbol{0} \boldsymbol{i \omega s}$, cp.
 is virtue operative in social relations we see from Eth. Nic. 5. 3. $1129 \mathrm{~b}^{25-1130}$ a 5 , and from the definition of virtue ascribed with whatever truth to Plato in Diog. Laert. 3. 9r, $\dot{\eta} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \delta \iota \kappa a \iota o \sigma v ́ v \eta$



 ä $\lambda \lambda$ dous. That there is a close connexion between justice and the other virtues, we see from Aristot. Fragm. 75. 1488 b 5, ap. Plut.






40. ả $\lambda \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Here, as Eaton points out, Aristotle has before him Plato, Gorg. 488 D.
42. $\lambda а \mu \beta a \nu о \mu e ́ v \omega \nu . ~ С р . ~ с . ~ 1 о . ~ 1281 ~ а ~ 17, ~ \pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu ~ \lambda \eta \phi \theta ́ ́ v \tau \omega \nu . ~$



 having intervened : compare the way in which $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ ö̃ $\iota$ takes up $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ © $\dot{s}$ in 1283 b 17 sqq. after an intervening hypothetical sentence.
1283 b. 2. oi $\pi \lambda$.úvıo kaì єủyєveîs. The article is omitted before єujyeveis because the rich and noble are classed together in contradistinction to the good: cp. 1283 a 33, oi é $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \epsilon \rho о \iota$ кaì єủ $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon i ̂$.
 a mass composed of citizens.' Пo入ıтькóv is added because there is such a thing as a non-citizen $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os (4 (7).4. 1326 a 18, àvaүкaiov
 $\kappa a i ̀ \xi \in \nu \omega \nu)$.


 Sallust, Bell. Iugurth. 19.7, pleraque ex Punicis oppida, and 30. 4, unam ex tam multis orationem cius.
5. тois $\gamma$ àp kupioıs $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon ́ \rho o u \sigma \iota \nu ~ a \lambda \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu$, 'for it is just in respect of the supreme authority they constitute that they differ from each other' (Bernays).


 see note on izioa 6 .
 These constitutions settle the matter in their own way, but still we persist in asking how it ought to be settled. Taûta refers to oit $\tau$ '
 the gender, see above on 1263 a .
9. $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \delta \grave{\eta} . . .13$. $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi \xi$ aủtต̂y. 'Well, if those who possess virtue are quite few in number, in what way should we determine the question? Or perhaps we should [not trouble about their number in itself, but] consider the expression "few" in relation to the work they have to do, [and ask] whether they are able to govern the State, or whether they are numerous enough to constitute a State ?' Thurot (Études sur Aristote, p. 47) and Susemihl think that this paragraph should be transposed so as to precede
 place. The discussion of the question just raised is introduced by $\delta \dot{\eta}$, as often elsewhere (e.g. in c. 4.1277 a $14-16$ and c. 15.
 9. Aristotle's first impulse is to challenge the claims of the good to rule on the score of the smallness of their number, as he has already done in c. IO. 1281 a 28 sqq. But he drops this ground of attack, probably because he feels that paucity is no bar to a claim to rule. Even a single individual may have a just claim to rule, if his virtue is transcendent. Hence he passes on in 13 sqq. to deal with another objection, the discussion of which brings out this fact. The claims of the good have a weak point which they share with those of the rich and noble. Just as the claims of the rich and noble to rule may be defeated by those of one man who is richer or nobler than all the rest, so the claims of the good may be defeated by those of one man who is better than all the rest. And the claims of the Many may be defeated in a similar way. If this superiority of One Man or of a Few not numerous enough to constitute a State is overwhelming, the fact that they are not numerous enough for
this must not stand in the way of our giving him or them supreme authority.

$\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o v \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. 'Aliquoties enunciatio per ©́s introducta per ถ̈ $\iota \iota$ continuatur, e.g. in Phys. 6. 2. 233 a 13 sq.: 1. 7 . 190 b 17 sqq.: 8. 7.260 a 23 sqq .' (Bon. Ind. 872 a I). For the repetition of $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu$, see vol.ii. p. li, note 6. For the thought, cp. 8 (6). 3. I 3 I 8 a 22 sqq.








17. катג̀ тò גủтò Síkalov. Cp. c. 17. I288 a I9 sqq.
18. For the juxtaposition of $\tau \grave{\nu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \dot{\epsilon} v a$ and $\dot{\alpha} \pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \omega \nu$, see notes on 1281 a 13 and 1285 a 3.
23. оüкoûv к.т. ., ' 'therefore if the Many also really ought to be $^{\text {2 }}$ supreme because they are stronger' (kpeitrovs, not ajueivous) 'than the Few.' Cp. 1283 a 40 sqq. Aristotle has before him Plato, Gorg. 489 E sqq. (Eaton). For $\epsilon i \ldots \gamma \epsilon$, cp. Plato, Rep. 433 C, єỉ ס́éo $\gamma \in$ крîval.
27. $\pi$ ávтa $\delta \grave{̀}$ таûta к.т. $\lambda$. "Opoı are here 'criteria,' such as wealth or virtue, on the strength of which men claim political supremacy. Plato had already used the expression ó $\rho \theta$ òs ópos in

 is not convincing. It does not follow that a claim is bad because it does not hold under all circumstances.
30. kaì $\gamma$ à $\delta \eta \dot{\eta}$, 'for surely.'
31. For кupious toû mo入ıтєúpatos, an expression which does not, I think, occur elsewhere in the Politics, cp. Diod. 15.45 .2 , тoîs éri

 because Aristotle is thinking of the individuals of whom $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{\eta}$
 He often, however, uses a plural verb with a neut. plur. nominative, even where this explanation does not hold good: see Waitz on Anal. Pr. 2. 26. 69 b 3, and Bonitz on Metaph. A. 4. 985 a 27.
$\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \lambda \dot{\jmath} \theta \eta$, as in $7(5)$. II. 13 14 b 2 and Diod. 9. 24. 2, oủ $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \grave{a}$
 and Soph. 268 B (Liddell and Scott).
35. à $\theta$ póous, not $\dot{\theta} \theta \rho o ́ o \nu: ~ c p . ~ 1 . ~ 2 . ~ 1252 ~ b ~ 14, ~ o i ̂ k o s ~ . ~ . ~ o u ̂ s ~ к . \tau . ~ \lambda . ~$
 not only led to the conclusion stated in 27 sqq ., but are enabled to solve an àmopía which is raised by some persons. Tov̂тov тò̀ т $\rho o ́ \pi о \nu$, ' on this basis,' i. e. on the basis of a recognition of the claims both of the Better and of the Many. Who were the persons who raised this ȧтopia? It is difficult to say, though some approach is made to the question by the disputants in Plato, Gorg. $488 \mathrm{~B} \mathrm{sqq.:} \mathrm{cp}$.


 says in c. Alcib. c. 6, каiтo九 тaîтa ס七є́ $\gamma \nu \omega \sigma \tau a \iota ~ a ̈ \rho \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \delta о \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu, ~$



 have є́тiӨєı дópov in 2. 8. 1268 a 6: cp. 6 (4). 12. 1296 b 36.
39. öтav oupßaivn tò $\lambda \epsilon \chi \theta \epsilon \in \nu$, i.e. when the Many taken collectively are better than the Few. The contrary case is dealt with

 à $\pi$ ooooṽ $\iota, 3^{6} \ldots \pi \lambda \epsilon o o^{\nu} \omega \nu, 39$, parenthetical, but the length of the parenthesis by which on this view these words are parted from the words which they qualify makes against this interpretation, and it seems preferable to take them, as Bekker and others do, with

40. тò $\delta^{\prime}$ ỏ $\rho \theta$ òv $\lambda \eta \pi \tau \in \in \circ$ '̈o $\omega$ s, 'but [the advantage of neither is to be studied exclusively, for] we must determine that which is correct and normal in a fair and equal fashion.' For $\lambda \eta \pi \tau \epsilon \in \nu$, cp. Eth. Nic.
 Bávetv est animo concipere, ita quidem ut modo investigandi (Waitz ad Anal. Post. 1. 4. 73 a 24 ), modo inveniendi cognoscendi definiendi intelligendi vim habeat' (Bon. Ind. 422 b 38 ). " $I \sigma \omega s$ is used in the
 $\mu о р i \omega v$.
 said the same thing, as Giph. points out, p. 37 I : cp. Cic. De Offic.

1. 25.85 , omnino qui rei publicae praefuturi sunt duo Platonis praecepta teneant: unum, ut utilitatem civium sic tueantur, ut quaecumque agunt ad eam referant obliti commodorum suorum; alterum, ut totum corpus rei publicae curent, ne, dum partem aliquam tuentur, reliquas deserant. Cicero perhaps refers to Plato, Rep. 420 B. Solon claimed that he had endeavoured to be fair both to the Few and to the Many (Fragm. 5).
 on $127^{6} \mathrm{~b} 28$. Compare with the form of the sentence which


 citizen in general is he who shares in ruling and being ruled is based on c. 4 : in C. I, on the other hand, the citizen is defined as


 т $\rho \frac{o}{\pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma}$. Aristotle takes it for granted here that the citizens of the 'best State' will both rule and be ruled, and thus anticipates the conclusion at which he arrives after a discussion in 4 (7). I4. $133^{2}$ b 12 sqq.
2. ròv Bíov ròv kat àpetív. For virtue is the main source of 'the most desirable life,' which the citizens of the best State are said to live in 4 (7). r. 1323 a 14 sqq. Cp. also 6 (4). 2 . 1289 a 30 sqq.
 what precedes; it deals with the contrary case to that supposed in öтav cuvßaivp тò $\lambda_{\epsilon \chi} \theta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu, 1283$ b 39. The sense is, 'but if there is one man or a few of transcendent virtue, we must not treat them as citizens on a level with the rest, or expect them to be content with ruling and being ruled; their part is to rule.' To insert
 eis к.т.ג., as Sus. does, is to destroy the connexion. Aristotle probably has before him Plato, Rep. 540 D , örav oi $\dot{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ à̉ $\lambda \eta \bar{\omega} \mathrm{s}$

 are added because Aristotle is now dealing only with the case in which the Good exist in the same community with those possessing other attributes essential to the State (cp. $1283_{3}$ a 42 sqq.). If the Good are numerous enough themselves to constitute a State, as in
the case of the State sketched in the Fourth and Fifth (old Seventh and Eighth) Books, then the State will consist of equals, and they may each of them be treated as part of it and subjected to law.
 Sus.) here and in ro, 'their political capacity,' and $\tau \hat{g} \delta \nu v v_{\mu} \mu \varepsilon$, I 3 ,
 Sepulveda explains, 'facultatem civilem vocat quicquid opis in homine est quod faciat ad civilem societatem iuvandam tuendamque,
 à $\rho \in \tau \dot{\eta}$ answers to $\pi \rho o a u \rho o u ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$. For the distinction implied between virtue and political capacity, cp. 7 (5). 9. 1309 a 33 sqq., where

 ápíctav. $\Delta v \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon t$ is used in a different sense, that of 'political influence,' in 20 , and $\pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \grave{j}$ סívapıts often bears this sense (e. g. in Eth. Nic. 1. 9. 1099 a 33 sqq. and Plato, Rep. 473 D), but not, I think, here.
 as mere fellow-citizens of the rest (cp. 4 (7). 4. 1 326 a 20 ), and expect them to take their turn with the rest of ruling and being ruled. Men of this transcendent excellence stand to their inferiors as a whole stands to its part (3.17. 1288 a 26 sqq.).


 Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective s.v.).
 $\theta \in \dot{\partial} \nu$ è $\nu$ قeoís. A god among men is in a position of transcendent superiority not enjoyed by a god among gods. For the meaning



and (with Crusius, Untersuchungen zu den Mimiamben des Herondas, p. 3) Antiphanes, Tpırayшııテтís (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 121),


See Crusius ibid. Cp. also Plato, Rep. 360 C.
VOL. III.
3. $\mathbf{z} \theta \epsilon \mathrm{v}$, because treating them as part of a State involves injustice.
4. кaì $\eta \grave{\nu} \nu \nu \mu 0 \theta \epsilon \sigma i \alpha \nu$, 'legislation no less than treating men as part of a State.' Aristotle still has the lawgiver in view whom he has imagined in 1283 b 36 sqq., and is still advising him as to the course he should adopt. If men of the type described exist in the State, he must abstain from meddling with them ; he must not attempt to fetter them by legislation.
 in capacity.' Gods are superior to men in both these respects: as to kings, cp. 7 (5). 10. 1310 b 12 . Proportional equals are no doubt included under roùs iloous: we may infer this from Eth. Nic.



 каì עó $\mu$ os $\pi \rho$ òs aùroús. Contrast with this view of law as existing only between equals or proportionate equals the Stoical view set forth by Cicero in De Legibus 1. 7. 23, est igitur, quoniam nihil est ratione melius estque et in homine et in deo, prima homini cum deo rationis societas. Inter quos autem ratio, inter eosdem etiam recta ratio est communis. Quae cum sit lex, lege quoque consociati homines cum dis putandi sumus. Inter quos porro est communio legis, inter eos communio iuris est.


 of кaтá is no doubt 'against,' but of кa兀á in the passage before us among others Bonitz says (Ind. 368 a 34), 'saepissime per кaтá tivos ea res significatur de qua aliquid dicitur vel cogitatur.' See
 $\kappa a \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \pi a \sigma \omega ิ \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \sigma \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \epsilon ิ \nu$. Still Aristotle may remember here the expression of Callicles in Plato, Gorg. 488 D, where he says of

 laws are especially thought of, laws, for instance, enforcing on the persons referred to an equality of rights (cp. кaт' aùt $\bar{\nu}, \mathrm{I} 5$ ). I incline to think that 'against' is nearer to the meaning of катá here than 'concerning.' Bern. Sus. and Welldon translate in a more neutral fashion 'for.'
 ád入’ à̀тòv $\dot{\omega} s$ ồvta vó $\mu o \nu$. This is as much as to say that they are Absolute Kings. The Persian King was a law to the Persians

 $\left.\mu^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \cap v\right)$. This explains the exclamation of Anaxarchus to Alexander, when the latter had murdered Cleitus and was lying speechless




 áтактои̂̀та каì ко入á̧̧ıv. It was claimed in Justinian's time that to the

 Mommsen, Röm. Staatsrecht, 2. 713 . 2, ed. 1).
5. $\lambda \epsilon \in \nprec \circ \iota \epsilon \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \hat{a ̀ \nu ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ C o r a y ~ r e m a r k s ~ o n ~ t h i s ~ p a s s a g e, ~ " \epsilon ่ \nu \tau \epsilon \hat{u}-~}$

 ed. Halm, Fab. 24 r. The lions asked the hares, 'Where are your claws and teeth ?' (Camerarius, Interp. p. 132). Cp. 8 (6).3. I 3 I 8 b
 фpovrílovalv, and the words of Callicles in Plato, Gorg. 483 E,


 Cp. also Philemon, Inc. Fab. Fragm. 3 (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. $3^{2}$ ),


Antisthenes may have related the fable here alluded to in his 'Cyrus, or on Kingship,' a work mentioned by Diogenes Laertius, 6. 16. Had he before him a version of the fable of the Lion and the Wild Ass (Babrius, Fab. 67) in which lions and hares joined in hunting and fell into a dispute as to the division of the spoil? Compare the fragment of the lyrical poet Cydias preserved by



 Cydias, Fragm. $\mathbf{I}$.

17．Sıò каì tiӨevtal к．т．入．，＇hence＇（i．e．from a sense of the immense superiority of certain men）＇States democratically con－ stituted also institute the ostracism［in addition to adopting other democratic measures］for the reason which has been mentioned＇ （i．e．because they feel that these men are too superior to the rest to be treated as equals）．It appears indeed later on（35）that oligarchies also got rid of over－powerful individuals，and in a less humane way than democracies，for they exiled them and put them to death．The democratically constituted States referred to include （in addition to Athens）Argos（7（5）．3．I302 b IS），Miletus，and Megara（Schol．Aristoph．Eq．855）．At Syracuse the ostracism was for a time represented by the petalism，which，it may be noted，would seem to have been introduced when the constitution of Syracuse was not a democracy，but what Aristotle variously
 1304 a 27 sqq．）．The account given in the passage before us of the object of the ostracism resembles that given in $7(5) \cdot 3.1302 \mathrm{~b}$ ${ }_{1} 5$ sqq．and（in substance）the more detailed account given in ＇A $\theta$ ．Пo入．c．22，and it is probably correct．It is accepted by Schömann，Gr．Alt．I． 88 sqq．and by Gilbert，Const．Antiq． of Sparta and Athens，Eng．Trans．，p．${ }^{151}$ sq．，though Grote （Hist．of Greece，3． 197 sq．）and Susemihl（Sus．${ }^{2}$ ，Note 603： Sus．${ }^{4}$ ，I．p． 4 15）conceive the object of the ostracism to have been to put an end to dangerous rivalries between two leading statesmen by removing one of them beyond the limits of the State．Aristotle＇s account of its object receives confirmation from Thuc．8．73．3， from Philochorus，Fragm． 79 b（Müller，Fragm．Hist．Gr．1．396）， and from Diod．II． 55 and I9．I（compare Diodorus＇account of the object of petalism，II．86．5－87．2）．See also Plut．Aristid．c．i， Pericl．c．7，and Themist．c．22．At Athens，however，and probably elsewhere（cp． 1284 b 20，$\tau$ às $\pi$ ó $\lambda \epsilon \iota$ ），the ostracism ceased after a time to be used for the object for which it was instituted and was perverted into an instrument of faction（бтa⿱艹兀aбткิิs，22）． Aristides was not ostracized because he was disproportionately powerful，but because he was an opponent of whom Themistocles wished to be rid．Damon the musician was not ostracized because he was dangerous to the State，but because he was a friend of Pericles．Aristotle regards the original object of the ostracism as not wholly illegitimate．He would indeed prefer that the constitu－ tion and the laws should be so framed as to prevent the rise within
the State of any disproportionately powerful person ( 7 (5).3.1302 b 18 sqq. : 7 (5). 8. 1308b 10-18)-with this end in view he would avoid creating great offices held for long terms ( 7 (5). 8. 1 308 a 18 sqq., b rosqq. : cp. 7 (5). 10. 13 10 b 20 sqq.), and would seek to equalize property ( 2.7 .1266 b 14 sqq. : $7(5) .8 .1309 \mathrm{a} 23 \mathrm{sqq}$.) and to increase the number of the moderately well-to-do (6 (4). I I. 1296 a I-5)-but, if measures of this kind should fail of their object, he recommends ( $7(5) .8 .1308 \mathrm{~b}$ 19) that any sentence of removal inflicted on disproportionately powerful men shall be a sentence of removal beyond the limits of the State, in other words he recommends something very like the ostracism. That both the petalism and the ostracism had the evil effect of discouraging the participation of the more distinguished citizens in political life, we see from Diod. 11. 87.3 sqq. and from Plutarch's Life of Pericles (c. 7). If there is any truth in Plutarch's view that in choosing the side of the Many Pericles was influenced to some extent by a dread of the ostracism, the institution gave a decisive turn at that moment to the constitutional development of Athens.
19. aû̃ar yàp $\delta \dot{\eta}$ к.т...., 'for these, I suppose, are thought to pursue equality more than anything else ': cp. 6 (4). 4.1291 Ib 34 sq. and 8 (6). 2. 13 18 a 3 sqq. Aristotle says 'are thought,' because democracies pursue only one kind of equality, arithmetical equality, and lose sight of equality based on desert (7 (5). r. I 3 о I b 29 sqq.). 'Even now one discovers a tendency in the United States, particularly in the West, to dislike, possibly to resent, any outward manifestation of social superiority. A man would be ill looked upon who should build a castle in a park, surround his pleasure-grounds with a high wall, and receive an exclusive society in gilded saloons' (Bryce, American Commonwealth, $3.3{ }^{15}$ ).
 Soph. O. T. 540,





 $\kappa a i\rangle \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \not ँ \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \tau о o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$. That the possessor of these advantages was not unlikely to be ostracized, we see from what is said of

 We learn what Aristotle means by $\tau \iota \nu a$ ä $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu \tau u \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \eta ̀ \nu ~ i \sigma \chi \nu ́ \nu$ from
 int̀ $\rho$ тov̀s $\pi o \lambda \lambda o v ̀ s ~ \nu o \mu \iota \zeta o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o s ~ v i \pi \epsilon ́ \pi \iota \pi \tau \epsilon \nu$, though he may perhaps hint that even virtue; as in the case of Aristides, was a cause of ostracism at Athens.
21. $\mu \in \theta_{i \sigma \tau \alpha \sigma \alpha v}$, the technical word used in cases of ostracism: cp. Philoch. Fragm. 79 b (Müller, Fragm. Hist. Gr. I. 396), тои̂тоע
 [Demosth.] c. Aristog. 2. 6. The same word is used of the banishment of involuntary homicides (Demosth. c. Aristocr. c. 45, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime}$
 and is a milder term than even $\dot{\epsilon}^{*} \kappa \beta$ á $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota$.
 1335 a 27. Ten years, or, according to Philoch. Fragm. 79 b, originally ten, and afterwards five. Diodorus (11.55.2) makes the term five years. In the petalism it was five (Diod. ri. 87. ). A temporary absence from the State would not indeed make the ostracized person less wealthy or less well-born, but it would sever him from his friends and followers, and so tend to diminish his influence.
$\mu u \theta$ одоүєіттаı Sè к.т. $\lambda$. See Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 604 (Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. p. 4 r6), who refers to Pherecydes of Leros, Fragm. 67 (ap. Schol. Apollon. 1. 1290:




 See also Prof. Robinson Ellis' note on Catullus 64. 23, where the expression 'mater ' probably refers to the Argo-' the idea is not unnatural in itself and agrees with the recurring representations of the Argo as an animate being ('A $\rho \gamma \dot{\omega}$ a proper name, like Eido, Hypso, Aphro, Brimo, Ioulo), possessed of voice and reason and in part divine. Philo Iud. vol. ii. p. 468 (quoted by Nauck, Fr.


 (rather av́dá $\sigma o \nu$ ) छúdov; Apollod. 1. 9. 19'.(quoted above), 'cf. r. 9. $\mathbf{2 4}$, places which all seem to refer to the piece of speaking timber (aúठĵधע סópv) which Athene built into the cut-water, and which

Apollonius describes as urging the start from Pagasae (i. 525 ) and warning the Argonauts to expiate the murder of Absyrtus by a visit to Circe (iv. 580 sqq .).'
23. Sıà roaúrnv aitiav, 'for a similar reason ': cp. 4 (7). í. 1335 a 19 and 7 (5). 6. 1306 a 6 and b 17 . Not тìv тoaúrqע, as in 18 .
26. Sıò k.т... Kaì roùs 廿'́youtas, 'among others those who blame.' In roùs $\psi^{\prime}$ 'रovras к.т.... Aristotle probably refers to Sosicles the Corinthian and the speech which he is represented in Hdt. 5. 92 to have addressed to the representatives of the Lacedaemonians and their allies gathered in council, in which, while recounting the misdeeds of the tyrants of Corinth, he dwelt especially on the hint given by Thrasybulus tyrant of Miletus to Periander tyrant of Corinth to get rid of the men who overtopped the rest. Compare Eurip. Suppl. 433 Bothe, 447 Dindorf,

 тó入 $\mu a s$ à á
Herodotus, as has been said, makes Thrasybulus give the hint to Periander, whereas Aristotle here makes Periander give the hint to Thrasybulus, but any one who compares the two narratives will see that the story as told by Aristotle is a shortened version of that of Herodotus. How then are we to account for the inversion in it of the parts played by Periander and Thrasybulus? We have already noticed other instances in which a slight divergence from a narrative of Herodotus is observable (see above on 1262 a 19 and 1276 a 28 ), and the same thing occurs again in 4 (7). 2.1324 b 17 sq. Aristotle's memory may have betrayed him, as it did in the mention of Hector in Eth. Nic. 3. ir. iri6a 33 (see below on 1285a 12) and of Calypso in Eth. Nic. 2. 9. iro9a 3r, where Hom. Odyss. 12. 219 is referred to, but, if this was so, the slip must have been something more than a mere momentary one, for it recurs in 7 (5). 10. 1311a 20. It is natural that Aristotle should credit Periander with the advice, for he believed that many of the traditional maxims of tyranny came originally from Periander (7 (5). If. 1313a 36). We notice that Herodotus, a Greek of Asia Minor, ascribes the famous hint to a tyrant of Miletus, while Aristotle, a Greek of Europe, ascribes it to a tyrant of Corinth. For the dative éarvßoúx $\varphi$ dependent on the substan-

$\gamma \lambda \omega ́ \tau \tau \eta$ каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ є ́ \rho \mu \eta \nu \epsilon i a \nu ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda \eta ́ \lambda o t s, ~ a n d ~ s e e ~ B o n . ~ I n d . ~ I 66 ~ a ~ 61 ~ s q q . ~$
 ${ }^{\sigma} \nu \mu \beta$ и́л $є v \mu a$.

 c. 12. 1282 b 3 I , $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\rho} \mu \mathrm{o} i \omega \nu$ aủ $\lambda \eta \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \in \chi \nu \eta \nu$, and see Vahlen on

30. о́ $\mu a \lambda \hat{v} v a$. 'O $\mu$ а $\lambda \dot{v} \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ is a rare word, but it is used by Plato in Tim. 45 E.
 of this kind the preposition is usually repeated in the Politics before the second substantive (e.g. in I. 8. 1256 b i 7 we have каì $\delta \iota a ̀ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi \rho \eta \bar{\eta} \tau \nu$ кai $\delta \iota \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$ ), and this is so whether 'both . . . and ' is expressed by каi . . . каi or by $\tau \epsilon \ldots$. . кaí, but sometimes the preposition is not thus repeated (e. g. in the passage before us and in 38 : in 2. 12. 1274 b 24: 3.11.1281 b 33: 4 (7). 7. 1328 a 20: 5 (8).7. 1341 b 19 : 7 (5). 10. 1311 a 29 and b 25 sq.: see also critical note on 1330 b 31 ). I have not noticed that the preposition is similarly omitted in the Politics when $\hat{\eta}$. . . $\tilde{\eta}^{\prime}$, oṽтє . . . oṽтє

 $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\tau} \tau \downarrow \omega \bar{\nu}$.
37. тро́тоข тivá. See above on 1255 a 13 .


39. oiov 'A $\begin{gathered}\text { nuaior } \mu \grave{v} \nu \text { к.т. } \lambda \text {. It is clear from this that the }\end{gathered}$ Samians, Chians, and Lesbians were the most powerful States of the Athenian alliance. They had been the leaders in the transfer of the headship of the maritime league against Persia from the Lacedaemonians to Athens (Plut. Aristid. c. 23). Niletus was no longer their equal. We read in ' $A \theta . \Pi о \lambda . c .24, \pi \epsilon \epsilon \sigma \theta_{\text {entes }}$


 "ip $\quad$ оутеs. This remark is obviously not true of the period subsequent to the revolt and subjugation of Samos in B. C. 440 , and it probably refers to the Athenian Confederacy in its earlier days before it was converted into an Empire. If we understand it thus, it is not inconsistent with the passage before us. But it is not easy to say what were the infractions of treaties to which Aristotle
alludes. He appears to refer to humiliations inflicted by Athens on Samos, Chios, and Lesbos at a comparatively early period of her ascendency, 'as soon as she had taken a firm grip of her rule.' He can hardly refer, therefore, to humiliations which followed the suppression of revolts, for Samos did not revolt till b. c. 440 , nor Mytilene till B.c. 428 , nor Chios till b. c. 41 2. Besides, he seems to be speaking not of humiliations brought about by disloyalty on the part of these States, but of humiliations prompted by Athenian jealousy of their greatness. Athens may have prohibited wars between one of these States and other members of her alliance (see the speech of Hermocrates in Thuc. 6. 76)-it was a prohibition of this kind that led to the revolt of Samos (Thuc. 1. $15_{5}$ ) -or demanded the removal of fortifications (compare the case of Chios in b. c. $4^{2} 5$, Thuc. 4.5 1), or meddled with their territory (as in the case of Thasos, Thuc. I. 100). No doubt, the Mytilenean envoys in Thuc. 3.9 sqq. (see Grote, Hist. of Greece, 6. 309), speaking in B. C. $4^{28}$, do not charge Athens with any infractions of treaties ; on the contrary, they speak of their State having been ' honoured' by Athens, and ascribe their revolt to fear of ultimate subjugation, not to actual wrongs inflicted on Lesbos in the past. Still Plutarch implies in Aristid. c. 25 (where he perhaps follows the same authority as Aristotle does in the passage before us, for

 infractions of treaties in her relations with her dependent allies, and it is likely enough that Samos, Chios, and Lesbos did not escape. That a time did come when Athens changed her original easygoing headship into a firm imperial control, we see from Thuc. 6. 76 and Diod. ir. 70 . Diodorus (who may here represent Ephorus, a witness likely to be favourable to the dependent allies, as he belonged to the Aeolic Cyme) dates the commencement of this change from the time when Athens became aware that the Lacedaemonians had abandoned all thought of attempting to regain the headship of the maritime league by war. This happened as early as b.c. 475, if Diodorus' chronology is to be trusted (Diod. ir. 50.8).
 only to severities inflicted by the Persians on the Medes, Babylonians, and others after the suppression of revolts (see as to Babylon Hdt. 1. 183 and 3. 159 and Arrian, Anab. 3.16. 4 and
7. 17.2), but also and more especially to unprovoked evidences of






 єủkаӨєкто́татоь єìยע. Egypt is probably referred to in $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ тoùs


 Persian rule in Laws 697 D, which explains Alexander's triumph.
1284 b. 2. $\pi \epsilon \phi$ рог $\eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \mu$ ย́vous. 'A word occurring in the Politics alone of Aristotle's writings, but not very uncommon there, is фрои $\eta \mu a \pi i-$ $\zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. It occurs later in Polybius and is certainly un-Attic. It is entirely absent from the 'A $\theta$. Пo入., where $\theta a \rho \rho \epsilon \bar{\nu} \nu$ takes its place'


Є̇пє́коптє. 'Епıко́лть is a rare word; the passage before us is, so far as I know, the earliest prose passage in which it occurs. It is a technical term of arboriculture, to 'lop' or 'pollard' (Theophr.

 тò äкроу), and its metaphorical meaning in the passage before us agrees pretty closely with that of $\dot{\epsilon} \tau a \pi \epsilon i \nu \omega \sigma a \nu$ in 1284 a 4 I .
3. $\pi \in \rho \grave{~ m a ́ \sigma \alpha s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi o \lambda ı \tau \epsilon i ́ a s, ~ k a i ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ o ̉ p ~} \theta$ ás, 'with regard to all constitutions, even the normal ones.' Cp. De Gen. An. 4. 2. 767 a
 gather from ${ }^{2} 5 \mathrm{sqq}$. that the best constitution will expel, if necessary, men who are disproportionately superior in wealth or political influence, though not men disproportionately superior in virtue. As to the importance of $\sigma v \mu \mu \epsilon \tau \rho i a$ in the members of a State, see 7 (5). 3 . 1302 b 33 sqq.
4. $\mu \in ́ v$ is answered by oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda a ́$, as in c. 4.1276 b 34, c. 6 . 1278 b 19 , and 4 (7). ェ. 1323 a 39 sqq.
5. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ r o ̀ ~ i ́ f ı o v ~ a ̀ \pi о \sigma к о \pi о и ̂ \sigma \alpha \iota . ~ T h e ~ o p p o s i t i o n ~ b e t w e e n ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~$
 noticed. The Index Aristotelicus gives no other instance of the use of ìтобкотєì by Aristotle. 'Eтьбкотєiц is also rare in the sense in which it is used in 6. It is not perhaps necessary to supply
áyatóv from the next line with rò tioıov: cp. Rhet. ad Alex. 30.
 (referred to by Bonitz, Ind. 339 a 22).
 that a part of a whole which is disproportionate to the whole to which it belongs is not tolerated.
8. ойтє is here followed by oữt and oủסè $\delta \eta$ ('nor yet surely'). See above on 1272 b 38 , and compare the somewhat similar sequence in c. 17. 1288a 24 sqq . In the passage before us the


10. ойтє vauтทүòs mри́भvav к.т. $\lambda$. We must apparently supply

 not fall out with his chorus because he excludes from it a disproportionately excellent singer, for his rule over his chorus is beneficial to it, as being exercised for the advantage of the ruled (c. 6.1278 b 39 sqq. ), ] and thus, so far as this practice at any rate is concerned, there is no reason why monarchs should not be in harmony with the States they rule, if, when they resort to it, their rule is beneficial to their States.' For $\mu^{\prime \prime} \nu$ solitarium see above on 1262 a 6 and 1270a 34. Taîs mónє $\quad$ I $I$ take to mean 'the States ruled by them' : cp. 33, $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda$ éas cival toùs rotoútovs
 1314 b 26 , tàs oiккías yvvaîkas.
15. Sıò к.т.入., 'hence in relation to acknowledged superiorities the argument in favour of the ostracism is not without a certain element of political justice.' $\Delta$ ó introduces an inference from the fact that constitutions which aim at the common good and practitioners of the arts resort to measures akin to the ostracism. Whatever restores the symmetry of the constitution is in a certain


 tion of the ostracism to cases in which there is no acknowledged superiority (such, for instance, as that of Hyperbolus). For the
 96 B , and Isocr. Hel. § 12 . ' $\Upsilon \pi \epsilon \rho o \chi a ́ s$ is in the plural because there are more kinds of superiority than one (Bon. Ind. 793 a 40 , ' $i \pi \epsilon \rho \circ \chi a i$, i. e. varia $\tau \bar{\eta} s$ i $\boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon} \rho \circ \chi \bar{\eta} s$ genera'); there is superiority in
virtue, in wealth, in command of friends, in birth, and so forth.

17. ßé̀tiov $\mu$ èv oủv к.т.入. 'True, it is better,' etc. The same thing is said in $7(5) \cdot 3.1302 \mathrm{~b} 18$ sqq. For the means by which Aristotle would effect this, see above on 1284 a 17 .
19. $\delta \in u ́ t \epsilon \rho o s ~ \delta \grave{̀} \pi \lambda o u ̂ s ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. On the proverb $\delta \in u ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o s \pi \lambda o v ̂ s$, see Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 1. 359 and 2. 24, where the lines of Menander are quoted ( $\Theta \rho a \sigma v \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$, Fragm. 2, ap. Stob. Floril. 59. 9: Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. I39),
(oủpiov Grotius, $\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o \nu$, $̇ \nu \nu$ or simply ė̀ MSS.: see Meineke, Fr.
 $\theta o \hat{\nu}, \mathrm{Sc} . \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a \nu$.
20. öтєр' oủk є̇yíyvєто $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon เ s, ~ ' ~ w h i c h ~ d i d ~ n o t ~ c o m e ~ a b o u t ~}$ in connexion with the States' (see note on 1327 b 7), a softened way of saying ' which was not done by the States.' Greek States did not use the ostracism to heal a defect in the constitution.
22. тоis óбтракıбцоîs, plural in the sense of 'acts of ostracizing.'
èv $\mu \epsilon{ }^{v} \nu$ oûv к.т.入., 'in the deviation-forms of constitution, then, that the practice of removing persons disproportionately superior is of advantage to each form severally and just according to their several views of justice, is evident, and perhaps this also is evident that it is not absolutely just.' It is not absolutely just, because it is resorted to in the interest of the holders of power, not in the common interest of all the citizens (4 sq.). Mèv oủv is answered by $a ̉ \lambda \lambda a ́, 25$.
 is emphasized by being placed before $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\cup} \pi \epsilon \rho \circ \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ : cp. c. 14. 1285 b
 $\tau \grave{\alpha} \kappa \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$, and $34, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \in ̀ \nu$ oủv $\delta \eta \mu о к \rho a \tau \iota \omega ิ \nu$ ai $\mu \in \tau a \beta o \lambda a i ́$.




oủ $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho \delta \grave{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle no doubt remembers, as Vict. points out, Heraclitus' indignant censure of the Ephesians for their expulsion of Hermodorus (see vol. i. p. 263 , note 2). Compare the language ascribed to the Persian King when Themistocles was driven from Greece to his court (Plut. Themist. c. 28, дакарібаs $\delta \dot{\varepsilon}$


 'envy of the good,' as we see from the epitaph on Aeschylus in Anthol. Pal. 7. 40,

Tis ф Oóvos, aỉ aû,

Theseus was believed by some to have been ostracized at Athens (Theophr. Fragm. I3 r). A current proverb ascribed a similar
 tepos (Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 2. 528). Observe that $\delta$ totov̂ros recurs four times in 28-34. This is probably intentional. As to repetitions of this kind see notes on 133 I b 18 , ${ }^{1} 317 \mathrm{~b} 5,1307 \mathrm{a} 14$, and 1325 bII , and compare the frequency with which roís $\vec{\eta} \theta \in \sigma \iota \nu$ or $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$ recurs in 5 (8). 5. 1340 a 28-39.
30. ${ }^{\circ} \lambda \lambda \alpha \dot{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ к.т.h. 'A $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu . . . \gamma \epsilon$, 'but certainly,' as elsewhere. Supply фaî́v ầ $\delta \in i ̂ v$. A question then arises as to the construction and punctuation of the sentence. Hampke (followed by Sus., though not without a good deal of hesitation) places

 ( $\phi$ â̂̀ $\nu \hat{a} \nu \delta \in i \nu$ ), but Susemihl doubts with some reason whether, if we adopt this view of the construction of the sentence, $\mu \in \rho i \zeta \rho \nu \tau \epsilon s$ should not be $\mu \in \rho i \xi o \nu t a s . ~ I n ~ a n y ~ c a s e ~ p e r h a p s ~ t h e ~ m o r e ~ n a t u r a l ~$ course is (with Bernays) to take $\mu \epsilon \rho i \zeta_{0 \nu \tau \epsilon s} \tau \dot{a} s$ ảp $\chi$ ás with what immediately precedes, i. e. with $\pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota \circ \nu . . . a \dot{\xi} \imath \imath \imath \epsilon \nu$, and not with $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$. . . rotoúrov. But then the further question arises, what is the meaning of $\mu \epsilon \rho i \xi o \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ràs áp $\chi^{\prime}$ s? Some have fancied that there is a reference to the 'distribution of offices' by Zeus among the other gods, when he had won supremacy in heaven (cp. Hesiod, Theog. 881-5, 112, and Aesch. Prom. Vinct. 228 sqq.), and have translated the passage, 'for to do so would be much the same thing as if men were to claim to rule over Zeus, distributing the offices (as he did when he succeeded to power).' But it is not likely that this is the meaning of the words. A different interpretation is suggested by the passage in which the conclusion arrived




 Compare with this passage 4 (7). 14. 1332 ${ }^{2} 3^{-27}$ and 3 . 16 . ${ }^{1287 a} 16-18$, and we shall find that the three passages lend
 in their tenure of the offices' ('gemäss einem reihenweisen Wechsel der Aemterbekleidung'), in which he is anticipated by Sepulveda, who however erroneously supplies oi $\theta$ eoi as the nom. to $\dot{\xi} \xi$ toiev. Sepulveda, in fact, explains the passage in his commentary thus 'simile, inquit, esset ac si Dii statuerent inter se, ut sic per omnes aut aliquos ipsorum iret imperandi vicissitudo, ut Iuppiter modo imperium teneret, modo esset sub imperio, quod esset absurdissimum.' But does $\mu \epsilon \boldsymbol{p}^{\prime} \xi_{\epsilon / \nu}$ bear this sense in any other passage? I am not aware that any such passage has been produced, and till it has, it will be safer to translate $\mu \epsilon \overline{\text { eisourtes }}$ тàs à $\rho \chi$ ás in the ordinary way, 'distributing the offices,' i. e. distributing them among themselves and Zeus, and treating him as on a level with themselves in the matter of ruling, or, in other words, as partly ruling and partly

 same as àģov̂vtes aủròv $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ lै $\sigma \omega \nu$. In Aristoph. Aves 467 sq. and 1225 sqq. (Didot) the Birds go further and claim to rule over Zeus and the gods without giving them even a turn of office. Bonitz remarks (Ind. 41 a $3^{1}$ ) on the construction $\pi a \rho a \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma t o \nu$ кầ $\epsilon i$ ' insolentior videtur usus formulae kầ $\epsilon i$ ubi kai pertinet ad
 as in the passage before us, with which he compares Phys. 8. 5. ${ }^{2} 57$ a 7 sqq. and (a passage very similar in structure to ours) $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$

 better of Zeus was proverbial (Hom. Il. r. 396 sqq. and 8.209 sq.), and indeed the difficulty of ruling over the gods (Eth. Nic. 6. 13. 1145 a 10 sq., already referred to by Eaton: Aesch. Prom. Vinct. 49, 356 sqq., Pers. 749 : Hom. Il. 8. 18 sqq.: Aristoph. Plut. 141 sqq. Didot: Diod. 17. 4r. r).
32. $\lambda \epsilon$ ímeтаı toivuv к.т.入. When willing obedience is rendered to a man, it is a sign that he is a natural King (Xen. Cyrop. 5. r.

 ßacìckìs cioios àpरŋ̀s. Is the passage before us present to Milton's memory in the address to Cromwell in the Defensio Secunda,
where we read, 'We all willingly yield the palm of sovereignty to your unrivalled ability and virtue, except the few among us who are either . . . or who do not know that nothing in the world is more pleasing to God, more agreeable to reason, more politically just, or more generally useful, than that the supreme power should be vested in the best and the wisest of men' (Prose Works, i. 288 Bohn)?
33. Bađinéas ả̊́íous. 'Forma accusativi pluralis plerumque ßacideis, veluti 2.9. 1271 a 26 : 2. 11. 1272b 37: 3. 14. 1285 a 26 :
 135 a 2 I sqq.), and also in $4(7) .14 .133^{2} \mathrm{~b} 24$. Baoinéas is the form found in Attic Inscriptions, though Bavìeis appears after в.c. 307 (Meisterhans, Gramm. d. att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. 110). The acc. plur. of iepeús in the Politics is iepeis and of imeev́s imetis. For the meaning of aitios see above on 127 I a 40 . Not mere temporary kings, like the $\beta$ aoideit mentioned in 8 (6). 8. I 322 b 29, but perpetual kings.

35 sqq. $\mu \in \tau \alpha \beta \hat{\eta} v a r$, because a transition is now made from C. 14. a question affecting all constitutions to the study of a single constitution, Kingship. Aristotle had said in c. 7.1279 a 23 sqq. that he would discuss the normal constitutions first, and Kingship is a normal constitution. The inquiries of the Twelfth and Thirteenth Chapters have had reference to the question of Justice, but now Aristotle asks whether Kingship is expedient, not whether it is just ; the two questions, however, do not lie far apart, and when he at length arrives at the end of the inquiry in c. 17.1287 b $3^{6}$ sqq., we find that an answer is given to both of them ( 1287 b 39, סikaov

 of the expediency of Kingship cannot be discussed until the various kinds of Kingship have been distinguished, for it may well be that one and the same answer will not hold good of all. Besides, Aristotle is not sorry to seize the opportunity which his classification of Kingships affords him of describing the various forms of Kingship and of correcting the error of those who regarded the Lacedaemonian Kingship as Kingship in a truer sense than any other Kingship according to law (1285a 3 sqq.); for he holds that the Lacedaemonian Kingship is, in fact, the least of those according to law. It is the expediency of the Absolute Kingship, however, that he really wishes to discuss. In his account of this form Aristotle
probably has the Persian Kingship before him (see notes on 1284 a 14 and 1287 a I). Socrates had described Kingship as always according to law (Xen. Mem. 4. 6. 12, ßacìeíal סé кaì tupaviìa

 ijyeito к.т....). Aristotle takes a different view. Just as in the classification of democracies and oligarchies in the Sixth (Fourth) Book forms in which law is supreme are marked off from those in which it is not, so here in the classification of Kingships the same is the case; but while the democracies and oligarchies in which law is not supreme are the worst, the form of Kingship in which law is not supreme is the best and highest. Aristotle's classification of Kingships would have been simplified, if he had first divided them into Kingships according to law and not according to law, and had then subdivided the class of Kingships according to law. His study of Kingship would probably have been fuller and more complete if he had not studied Kingship according to law on the way, as it were, to an examination of the question as to Absolute Kingship. We are grateful to him for studying barbarian Kingship as well as Greek, for in the case of other constitutions he is silent as to the non-Greek world, if we except his notice of the Carthaginian àpıcrokparía, and not entirely for want of material, for non-monarchical constitutions appear to have existed, for instance, in Lycia (see Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 185); but his treatment of barbarian Kingship is cursory in the extreme. It makes no pretence of being exhaustive, for the kind of barbarian Kingship which Aristotle selects for notice is said by him to exist only among 'some of the barbarians' (c. 14. 1285 a 17). It should also be noted that in the inquiry respecting the downfall and the preservation of Kingship and Tyranny contained in the Seventh (Fifth) Book no notice is taken of the distinction drawn in the Third between different kinds of Kingship, or of that drawn in the Sixth (Fourth) between different kinds of Tyranny. So again in 7 (5). 10. 13 13 a 10 Aristotle evidently implies the existence of Kingships not karà $\gamma^{\prime}$ evos, but it is not easy to say to what Kingships he there refers (see note on I3I3 a ro). One remark may be added. Aristotle classes under the head of $\beta$ aoineía dignities to which we should not allow the name of Kingship. The Aesymneteship, for instance, might be held for only a few months or years, yet it is treated by Aristotle as a form of $\beta a \sigma i \lambda e \dot{c}$. It is so because it is
exercised over willing subjects and is invested with large powers, for these are the two characteristics of $\beta_{a \sigma i d e i a}(7$ ( 5 ). 1о. 1 3 I 3 a 5 ). Baociceia may or may not be according to law, may or may not be кvрía $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu(c .14 .1285$ a 4, b 29), may or may not be elective, may or may not be hereditary, may even be for a less term than life, but these two characteristics are always found in connexion with it.




 mean 'broadly to any city and country which is to be wellconstituted politically.' We have been told in the preceding chapter that in some cases the best constitution must assume the form of a perpetual Kingship, but that does not preclude the raising of the question whether Kingship is advantageous to any political community which desires to be well-constituted or only to some. Aristotle's readiness to consider the question whether Kingship is expedient or not would be little in harmony with popular opinion in Greece, which was no doubt unfavourable to the institution: cp. Demosth. Philip. 2. ${ }^{25}$, $\beta a \sigma$ бiev̀s $\gamma$ à kaì
 though he praises Kingship in his Nicocles and Ad Nicoclemhe could hardly do otherwise in works written for a King--speaks of it in his Oration to Philip (§ 107) as little suited to Greeks, though indispensable to barbarians, and allows in his Nicocles ( $\$ 24$ ) that the Lacedaemonians and Carthaginians reserve it for use in war and are oligarchically governed at home. Xenophon's praises of Kingship in his Cyropaedeia refer, at any rate nominally, to a Persian King. Plato, however, had been bolder in his Republic and Politicus, for he certainly has Greeks in view when he adrocates in those dialogues Kingship of the most thoroughgoing kind. See on this subject vol. i. p. 277.
 territory occupied by villages,' as in Strabo, p. 336, $\sigma \chi \in \delta \dot{\partial} \nu \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ кai



 VOL. III.

 $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon o ́ v \omega \nu$. Nothing, however, is said of the $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a$ or $\epsilon \theta \nu o s$ in the recapitulatory summaries in c. 17. 1288 a 30 sqq. and 6 (4). 10. 1295 a 6 sqq.

 бтópatos $\delta$ ıaф̣opás.
1285 a.
2. Tท̂s dipXฑ̂s ó трóтоя. In some forms of Kingship (the barbarian Kingship and the Aesymneteship) the $\tau \rho o \sigma_{\pi} o s ~ \tau \hat{\eta} s ~ a \dot{a} \chi \chi \hat{\eta}_{s}$ is despotic ( 1285 a 22, b 2 sq.), in others not; in some the King is supreme over more things than in others (c. 15.1285 b 35 sqq.).
3. $\pi \alpha \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu$, sc. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \bar{\nu}$. For the juxtaposition of $\epsilon \bar{i}$ and $\pi a \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu$ see note on 1281 a 13 .
 second in his enumeration of forms of Kingship two existing forms, the Laconian and the barbarian, and then passes on to two obsolete forms, the Aesymneteship, which existed in the ancient days of Greece, and the Kingship of the heroic times.

ठокє $\hat{\imath}$, 'is thought,' by whom we are not told: possibly Plato's language in Laws $691 \mathrm{D}-692 \mathrm{~B}$ respecting the Lacedaemonian Kingship is present to Aristotle's mind. He does not agree with this view; he sees that there are Kingships according to law (the barbarian Kingship and the Aesymneteship) which are supreme over more things than the Laconian, and therefore are Kingships in a fuller sense, for the true King is кúpıos $\pi a \dot{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (c. 17. 1288 a 18 sq. : cp. Rhet. 1. 8. 1365 b 37). In Diog. Laert. 3. 82 a classification of Kingships into Kingships кaтà $\gamma^{\prime} \nu$ ขos and Kingships кarà $\nu{ }^{\prime} \mu o \nu$ is ascribed with very doubtful correctness to Plato, and the Lacedaemonian Kingship is brought under the former head, so that it is implied not to be катà עóдоv.
 the accusative (see Liddell and Scott).
 relating to war': cp. $1285 \mathrm{bI8}, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \circ \nu i a \nu$, and





we read in C. 17. 1288 a 9. In Philip. § 33, ^akéátuóvoo ס̀̀ toîs
 $\chi$ рóvov $\delta \epsilon \delta \dot{\omega} \dot{\kappa \pi} \pi \tau$, Isocrates appears to distinguish between the Kingship and the $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu o v i a$. According to Hdt. 6. 56 the Lacedaemonian Kings had the right to determine against whom war should be made ( $\pi \dot{\partial} \hat{\lambda} \epsilon \mu \nu \nu \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \nu \bar{\epsilon} \pi^{\prime} \hat{\eta}_{\nu}$ ầ $\beta$ oún $\omega \nu \tau a \iota \chi \dot{\omega} \rho \eta \nu$ ), and Gilbert holds (Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 46) that there are some indications that this right remained to them even in Xenophon's time (Xen. Hell. 5. 1. 34: 2. 2. 7: 4. 7. I), but Xenophon implies in Rep. Lac. 15. 2, каì orpatà̀ önoı åy $\dot{\eta}$ пónts $\dot{\kappa} k \pi \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \eta, \dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \bar{i} \sigma \theta a$, that the State and not the Kings possessed it.
 тà $\pi$ mò̀s tòv $\pi \dot{o} \lambda \epsilon \mu \nu \nu$. Something more is meant by this phrase than the offering of sacrifices to the gods, sacrifices such as the Kings of the heroic times offered ( 1285 b 10: cp. 8 (6). 8. 1322 b 26 sqq.), and it probably includes the right of the Lacedaemonian Kings to name the officers called Pythii, through whom the Delphic oracle was consulted (Hdt. 6.57.2), and to have the custody of oracles (6.57.4). We learn from Xen. Rep. Lac. 15 . I, é $\theta \eta \eta \in$
 övra, why it fell to the Lacedaemonian King to sacrifice. It was natural that the same authorities should be charged with matters relating to the gods and to war, for success in war was held to be given by the gods. In his account of the prerogatives of the Lacedaemonian Kings Aristotle omits to notice their share in deliberative authority as members of the senate, and also the judicial authority which, as we know from Hdt. 6. 57, they possessed in a particular class of cases (this had perhaps been narrowed: see above on 1270a 21).
 oủv roût cioios ßaoìcias, $\mathbf{1 4}$, and then at length finds a $\delta \dot{\delta}$ to answer to it in $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau a u ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ \delta ~ \delta \epsilon, ~ 16 . ~ A u ̈ \tau \eta ~ \grave{\eta} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a(c p .14)$ means 'this
 means 'this kind of justice,' for the Lacedaemonian Kingship is not the only Kingship included in the class, as we see from ${ }_{15}$,
 Io sqq. that the Kingship held by Agamemnon as leader of the Greek forces before Troy is included in it, a Kingship which we must not confuse with his Kingship of Mycenae, for his Kingship of Mycenae belongs to the fourth class of Kingships, ai karà roùs
 also referred to this class the Kingship, or Leadership, of Greece, which was held for a time by Agesilaus and for life by Philip and Alexander of Macedon. Compare Plut. Ages. c. 40, where Agesilaus is said to have been regarded until the defeat at Leuctra
 we read that in a dream which Agesilaus had at Aulis before embarking for Asia, he heard a voice addressing him thus,

 $\delta \eta \eta_{\pi o v \theta \epsilon v, ~ a n d ~ w i t h ~ I s o c r . ~ P a n a t h . ~ § 76 . ~ A t ~ a ~ l a t e r ~ t i m e ~ P h i l i p ~ o f ~}^{\text {7 }}$ Macedon was elected by the Congress at Corinth $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\omega} \nu$ (or $\sigma \tau \rho a-$
 5 : cp. Demosth. De Cor. c. 201 and Justin, 9. 4, and see Schäfer, Demosthenes, 3. I. 5I.3), and on his death his son Alexander was elected by the Congress to the same dignity (Diod. 17.4.9: Arrian, Anab. 1. 1. 2: Schäfer, Demosthenes, 3. r. 90. 1). Thus the office of $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \omega \dot{\nu}$, or $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o ́ s$, aúzoкрáт $\omega \rho$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s{ }^{\text {'E }} \mathrm{E} \mathrm{\lambda} \mathrm{\lambda áooos} \mathrm{in} \mathrm{the} \mathrm{hands} \mathrm{of}$ Philip and Alexander was an elective office and tenable apparently for life. Long before the time of Agesilaus and Philip, Gelon had
 Bápßapov (Hdt. 7. I58). Aristotle can hardly intend to include the Carthaginian Kingship under this form of Kingship, for in 2. Ir. 1273 a 30 he distinguishes between the offices of King and General at Carthage. He would seem to omit the Carthaginian Kingship from his enumeration, for it cannot fall under the head of the barbarian Kingship, though the Carthaginians were non-Greeks, inasmuch as its authority was by no means of a 'despotic' type. Would such an office as that of the rayós of the Thessalians be classed by Aristotle under this form of Kingship?
 סıà ßiov in 15 . A $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ òs aủтокрát $\omega \rho$ каì áiồos evidently had not the power of life and death. Vict. would read au̇roкрárop in place of aủгoкрaтóp $\omega \nu$, partly because the rendering of Vet. Int. is 'imperialis,' and Schneider and Sus., adopting his suggestion, place aúтокра́тюр in their text (see critical note on 1285 a 8). But, though arpainyòs aùroкpátap is a recognized title, I do not remember to have met with $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma i a$ aùтoкрát $\omega \rho$. With $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma i a$ tis aùroкратóp $\omega$ may be compared 7 (5).7. 1307 b 18, סuvaateian

an ordinary $\sigma \tau \rho a \pi \eta y^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}$ in having authority to deal with many questions for himself as to which an ordinary $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta y$ ós would have to consult the popular assembly or other supreme authority:



 So in Hicks, Greek Historical Inscriptions, No. 37 A. § 4, qvva-
 is explained by Mr. Hicks to mean ' not bound to consult the popular assembly.' Cp. also Thuc. 6. 26 and 5.27. It was the practice of Greek States to create $\sigma \tau \rho a \quad \eta \eta o \mathrm{c}$ aùrok $\rho \dot{\text { áropes }}$ to deal with crises, just as the Romans created a dictator, but the $\sigma \tau \rho a \pi \eta y$ òs aùroкрárop had not, like the dictator, the power of life and death, and more $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o i$ than one could be declared aüroкрátopes, whereas the dictatorship was always confided to a single individual, though on one or two occasions we find two dictators in existence at the same time (Mommsen, Röm. Staatsrecht, 2. 13I, ed. 1). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in fact, identifies the Roman dictator, not with the

 a tyranny in the hands of men like Phalaris (Rhet. 2. 20. I393 b io sqq. : cp. Pol. 7 (5). 10. 1310 b 28), Aristodemus of Cumae (Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7. 8), and Dionysius the Elder (Diod. 13. 94. 6).
 as for instance [in the Kingship existing] in the time of the ancients, on warlike expeditions by right of force.' 'Ev $\chi \in \iota \rho{ }_{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{s}$ $\nu \dot{\mu} \varphi$ ¢ is probably to be rendered 'manuum iure' (Lamb. 'lege ea quae est in manibus et armis posita'). It is opposed to $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu \delta i k n s$ $\nu \dot{\rho} \mu \varphi$ (Liddell and Scott s. v. vóuos). Where a person is slain by an exercise of the right which superior force confers, he is said to be slain év $\chi \in \rho \rho \dot{s} \boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \mu \varphi$, whether he is slain by his adversary on the battlefield or, as in the passage before us, by his King for cowardice in presence of the enemy. Eaton compares Thuc. 3. 66 , oûs $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$


 $\nu \dot{\mu} \mu \varphi$ 'als standrechtliches Verfahren' (' by process of martial law'), and Mr. Welldon follows him, but the use of the word $\chi$ tepooixau does not support this translation. In the kind of Kingship of
which Aristotle is speaking the King had, I conceive, the right to put to death with his own hand any of his warriors who showed cowardice on a warlike expedition; he had not the right to put any of them to death by judicial process. Sus. renders $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$ xє pòs уо́ня 'im Handgemenge' ('in the mêtée'), but I much prefer the interpretation given above. How would the King be able to slay one of his own men while himself engaged in a hand-to-hand

 seclusit Gifanius, Barı $\lambda$ cia eodem tempore secluserunt Bernaysius et Susemihlius.' The suggestion of Bern. and Sus. is not without plausibility, but I do not think that any change is called for. Aristotle's meaning is that the class of Kingship of which the Lacedaemonian Kingship is the type does not possess, as a class, the power of life and death, but that particular Kingships falling under the class do possess it, and he gives an instance of this. It is doubtful whether, as the emendation of Bern. and Sus. would imply, the Lacedaemonian King possessed the right to put a Spartan citizen to death ' in a certain case' ; we expect also to be told what case is referred to, but the only case mentioned is that of oi áp $\chi$ ầo. The Lacedaemonian King does not appear to have possessed the power which Kings of this type possessed $\epsilon \pi i \tau \omega \nu$ a $\rho \chi^{a} i \omega \nu$; the punishment provided by the Lacedaemonian law for oi т $\rho$ '́valtєs seems, on the contrary, to have been a severe form of àтццía (Plut. Ages. c. 30).
 (Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 618 : Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. p. 422 ). See also Il. 2. 224 sqq.
 above on 128ib 4, I3. Kaì ктєivat, not merely not to tolerate, but even to put to death.
$\lambda$ е́ $ү \in \iota$ yoûv к.т.入. The quotation is from Il. 2. 39I, where Agamemnon says,

In Eth. Nic. 3. if. ini6 a $3^{2}$ these threats are ascribed to Hector,




Aristotle probably remembered the similar threats placed by Homer in the mouth of Hector in Il. 15.348 (cp. Il. 12. 248 sqq.),
and was thus led into the error of ascribing the lines quoted by him to Hector, and not to Agamemnon. It will be seen that Aristotle abbreviates this passage of Homer in quoting it both here and in Eth. Nic. 3. II, that in the latter passage he

 after oicuoús, words which do not appear in our text. There is nothing surprising in the abbreviation or the substitution to which reference has been made, but the addition of $\pi \grave{a} \rho$ yà $\rho$ '̇ $\mu \grave{\imath}$ Aávatos is remarkable. The passages in which the text of Homer as quoted by Aristotle differs from the text handed down in the extant MSS. and other authorities are very numerous. A list of them will be found in Bon. Ind. 507 a 29 sqq. In some of them Aristotle's memory may well be at fault (compare his inaccurate quotation from Isocrates in Rhet. 3. 9. 1410 a 1 , and see Prof. Butcher in Class. Rev. 5. $310 \mathrm{sq}$. .), and if the addition before us stood alone, we might be tempted to account for it by supposing a confusion with aùrov̂ oi Aávatov $\mu \eta \tau i \neq o \mu a=$ in the similar passage, II. 15.348 sqq. But it does not stand alone. In 5 (8). 3. 1338a ${ }^{2} 5$ Aristotle attributes to Homer the line (which is not to be found in our Homer),
and in Rhet. 2. 9. 1387 a 33 sqq. he adds after Il. II. 542 ,

the following line, which does not occur in the MSS., but which Plutarch also found there (see De Audiend. Poet. c. 6. 24 C and c. $14.3^{6} \mathrm{~A}$ ),

So again, as we learn from Soph. El. 4. 166 b 6 sqq. (cp. Poet. 25.
 the address of the Dream to Agamemnon (II. 2. 23 sqq.), but they are not to be found there now, though the words $\delta i \delta \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \bar{\delta} \delta \epsilon^{\tau}$
eỉ̉os à $\rho$ '́ $\theta$ Oat occur in Il. 21. 297. For other instances of the same thing see Bon. Ind. 507 b $5^{2}$ sqq. Variations of this nature must probably be ascribed to a difference between the text of Homer which Aristotle had before him and that which has come down to us. Even as early as the time of Alcibiades it seems to have been usual for grammarians to 'correct' the text of


 Camerarius long ago pointed out (Interp. p. 134), Alexander possessed a copy of the Iliad corrected by Aristotle himself (Plut. Alex. c. 8: Strabo, p. 594). It is likely enough, therefore, that in the time of Alexander, and even earlier, more texts than one of Homer were current, with not a few varieties of reading. Recent discoveries of Homeric papyri add to the likelihood of this. See as to them Mr. F. G. Kenyon 'On the Geneva Fragments of Homer' in Class. Rev. 8. 134 sqq., and also in Class. Rev. 11. 406. The text of the quotations from the Homeric Hymn to Apollo given in Thuc. 3. 104 differs widely from that of our MSS. (see Mr. T. W. Allen in Journal of Hellenic Studies, vol. 15. p. 309).
13. oủ oi äpkıov évoeitat фuyéєur, 'it shall not be a sure thing for him to escape'-perhaps a Litotes for 'he shall have no hope of escaping.'
15. тoútwv סè к.т... Karà yévos does not perhaps necessarily imply that the Kingship passed from father to son, but only that it was confined to members of a given family. In place of aiperai we have in c. $\mathbf{1 5}^{5}$. 1285 b 39 кarà $\mu$ épos, a wider term, for an office held karà $\mu$ épos may be filled by election or otherwise. See below on 1285 b 39. To what elective Kingships of the Lacedaemonian type does Aristotle refer? Hardly to the Carthaginian (see above on 1285 a 7); perhaps, among others, to the office of $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \omega ̀ \nu$ aù ${ }_{\kappa} \rho a ́ \tau \omega \rho \tau \eta \eta s$ ' $E \lambda \lambda a ́ o o s$ held for life, as we have seen (above on 1285 a 7), by Philip of Macedon and Alexander : whether he refers to the office of rayós of the Thessalians, is doubtful, though this office was elective.
 Baoincias, as in 15, while in 1285 b 4 we have cioos $\mu$ movapxias Baai九ıкरेs. Yet in the recapitulation, 1285 b 20 sqq. (cp. c. 15 . 1285 b 34, 1286 a 5), all the forms which Aristotle enumerates are

barbarian Kingship and the Aesymneteship are really forms of Kingship or of Tyranny ; in 6 (4). 10. 1295 a 7 sqq. they are treated as forms of Tyranny shading off into Kingship, and we are there told that the barbarian Kingship was elective, which we do not learn here, unless it is implied in 1285 b 2 sq. (see note). He speaks of the 'barbarian' form of Kingship as existing only among 'some' of the barbarians of Europe and Asia. Other barbarian races perhaps had hereditary Kings whose power was more limited. Others again were not ruled by Kings at all; we hear, for instance, of Өpạkes àßaritevrot in Xen. Hell. 5. 2. 17. The Kingship of the Thracians, Illyrians, Phoenicians, and Ethiopians may have been of the type here described by Aristotle. Hardly the Molossian Kingship (7 (5). If. I3 13 a 23 sq .), or the Macedonian, for the Macedonians were very outspoken to their King (Polyb. 5. 27. 6,
 the Macedonian people seem to have been the judges in capital cases in time of peace (Abel, Makedonien vor König Philipp, p. I36, note).
 power of a Kingship is great, it will not be governed by law and hereditary. Tyranny is regarded by Aristotle as not hereditary, for though tyrannies often passed from father to son, the inheritor of
 is apparently not used by Aristotle elsewhere in the sense of 'hereditary,' and in 24,33 , and 1285 b 5, 9 we have $\pi$ átplos used in this sense, but $\pi a \tau \rho \iota k o ́ s ~ o f t e n ~ b e a r s ~ t h i s ~ m e a n i n g ~(e . g . ~ i n ~ T h u c . ~$ 1. 13). As to the extent of the authority of barbarian Kings, cp.


 phrastus, but Aristotle would say that the barbarian King also governed according to law): Plut. Reg. et Imp. Apophth. Antig. 8. 182 C : Eurip. Hel. 246 Bothe, 276 Dind.,

19. $\delta \iota \alpha$ ̀ yàp к.т. $\lambda$. This is added to explain how it happens that the law in these countries authorizes a despotic rule and that these Kingships are hereditary. As to the slavishness of barbarians, cp. Trag. Gr. Fragm. Adespota 29 I Nauck,
and Isocr．Philip．§ 107．Aristotle advised Alexander in ruling
 $\chi \rho \eta \bar{\sigma} \theta a \iota$（Aristot．Fragm．81．1489 b 27 sqq．：see note on 1324 b 36）．That Asiatics were especially slavish，we see from 4 （7）． 7 ． 1327 b 27 sqq．and Plut．De Vitios．Pud．c．10，$\pi a ́ \nu \tau \epsilon s$ oi $\tau \eta ̀ \nu$＇A Ááa
 $\sigma v \lambda \lambda a \beta \not \eta \nu$.
 sense of＇rule exercised for the advantage of the master＇（for then this form of Kingship would not be a normal constitution，as it is）， but＇despotic rule，＇as in 6 （4）．II．1295 b 2 I（cp． 7 （5）． 6. 1306 b 3）．

23．тupavııkaì $\mu$ èv oûv к．т．$\lambda$. ，＇thus while they are of a tyrannical type for the above－mentioned reason，they are safe＇（and therefore unlike tyrannies），＇because they are hereditary and in accordance with law．＇Does＇for the above－mentioned reason＇mean because the subjects are slavish，or because the power of the King is as great as that of a tyrant？Bernays and Welldon take the former view，but，looking to 1285 b 2 sq．and 6 （4）．10．1295 a 15 sqq．， I lean rather to the latter．It is easy to understand why conformity to law confers safety，but why are Kingships the safer for being hereditary？Probably because men more willingly submit to rule when it has come down to the ruler from his ancestors and has become traditional．Thus éxóvtav takes the place of $\pi$ árpta in 27.
 is composed of natives of the State for the same reason for which his tenure of power is safe，i．e．because it is hereditary and in accord－ ance with law，and therefore willingly submitted to．We see that Kings no less than Tyrants and Aesymnetes（c．15．1286 b 37 sqq．） had a bodyguard－usually at any rate，though perhaps not invariably （c．15．1286 b 6 sqq．）－but the King＇s bodyguard was not intended， like the Tyrant＇s，to secure his throne，but merely to enforce obedience on any of his subjects who might be for the moment recalcitrant （c． 15.1286 b 27 sqq．）．
 § 37．The Lacedaemonian Kings were guarded by citizens（Isocr． Epist．2．6）．

26．toùs סè tupávvous $\xi \in ⿺ 𠃊 八$ óv．According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus（Ant．Rom．7．8），Aristodemus of Cumae had
three bodyguards, one of the lowest of the citizens, another of manumitted slaves, and a third of hired barbarians.
30. Eitepov $\delta_{\text {è }}$ k.t.. ., 'and another which existed among the ancient Greeks, [the monarchy of those] who are called Aesymnetes.' The ciioos $\mu$ ovaplias is loosely explained by the name given
 тoús $\tau \in$ ßacileîs kaì đov̀s $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma o u ́ s$, and 8 (6). 8. 1322 b го. Pittacus and, it would seem, Peisistratus ( $7(5) \cdot 5 \cdot 1305$ a 7 sqq.) are counted by Aristotle among the ancient Greeks, but not of course Dionysius the Elder ( 3.15 .1286 b 37 sqq .). 'We find the word airvu $10 \eta \tau_{\eta} \rho$

 was not confined to the extraordinary magistrates to whom Aristotle here refers. At Cyme (we are not told which Cyme) the magistrates generally were called by this name (Aristot. Fragm. 48 r. 1556 b 44 sqq.) ; in Hom. Odyss. 8.258 the ai$\sigma \nu \mu \nu \eta$ ๆुraa are umpires in contests for prizes; and in Megara and her colony Chalcedon and also in Chersonesus, a colony of the Pontic Heracleia, which was itself a Megarian colony, the functions of the aiđ $\tau \mu \nu \hat{a} \tau a{ }^{2}$ or ai$\sigma \mu \nu \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ seem to have been those of the $\pi \rho v a_{\text {ávects }}$ at Athens (see Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 72. 3, 188. 1, 194. 5, 280. 1). We are here concerned, however, only with the extraordinary Aesymnete. The nature of his office may be gathered from Nic. Damasc. Fragm. 54 (Müller,






 hear of, unless the Aesymneteship of Tynnondas in Euboea (Plut. Solon, c. 14) was still earlier. The $\mu$ óvapरos é $\dot{\xi}$ ovaía which the Athenian Aristarchus held at Ephesus at the time of the overthrow of the Medes by Cyrus (в.с. 559) may possibly, as Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 141, points out, have been that of an Aesymnete, but this is not certain. The Aesymnete had larger powers than any Greek King-larger than even the Greek King of heroic times, for the administration of the State lay wholly in his hands. He is, in fact, commonly described as a tyrant ( 3 I : cp. c. 15.1286 b 38 : Plut. Solon, c. 14: Theophrast. ap. Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 5. 73),
though Pittacus is not unnaturally spoken of as a king in the popular ditty (Bergk, Poet. Lyr. Gr., Carm. Popul. 43),
ä $\lambda \epsilon \iota \mu v ́ \lambda a$ ä̀ $\lambda \iota^{\circ}$
каì үà Пıттакòs ả̀єî, $^{2}$
$\mu \epsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda a s ~ M \iota \tau v \lambda a ́ v a s ~ \beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon v ́ \omega \nu$.
Thus tyrants in early days were called Aesymnetes (Aristot. Fragm. 481. 1557 a 5 sqq.). The Aesymnete ruled кaтà 兀 $\grave{\nu}$ av́rov̂ $\gamma \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \eta \nu$ (6 (4). 10. 1295 a 16), though his office is implied in 1285 a $3^{2}$ to be кaтà עóноע: the law, in fact, empowered him to rule катà т $\grave{\nu} \nu$ aúroù $\gamma \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta \nu$. Like the tyrant, he had a bodyguard, though his bodyguard would be smaller than the tyrant's (c. 15. 1286 b 35 sqq.) and composed of citizens, like the bodyguard of the king, not of mercenaries, like that of the tyrant. Aristotle evidently conceives a resemblance to exist between the Aesymneteship and the barbarian Kingship (32), and it is possible that the Greeks borrowed this great office from the barbarians, for we are told in 6 (4). 10. 1295 a II that elective aùroкрátopes $\mu o ́ v a \rho \chi o \iota ~ e x i s t e d ~ a m o n g ~ s o m e ~ o f ~ t h e ~ b a r-~$ barians. Dionysius of Halicarnassus finds its equivalent in the Roman Dictatorship (Ant. Rom. 5. 73, є̈бть زà $\rho$ aipєтŋ̀ tupavvis $\dot{\eta}$





 Theophrastus evidently has this passage of the Politics before him, though he says nothing of the Aesymnetes mentioned by Aristotle who held office for life). The Aesymneteship resembled the Roman Dictatorship in being called into play 'in asperioribus bellis aut in civili motu difficiliore' (Speech of the Emperor Claudius in the Lyons Tables, 1. 28 : Mommsen, Röm. Staatsrecht, 2. 1. 140), but there were some important differences between the two offices. The Aesymnete, for instance, was elected by the people, whereas the dictator was named by one of the consuls. The dictator held office for not more than six months; Pittacus, on the contrary, remained Aesymnete for ten years (Diog. Laert. 1. 75), and Aristotle knew of Aesymnetes who held office for life. The dictator was always created to deal with some specified business; this was frequently, but not always, it would seem, the case with the Aesymnete. The Aesymnete was master of
the State in civil no less than in military affairs; the civil authority of the dictator was less extensive (Mommsen, Röm. Staatsrecht, 2. r. 14 r sqq.). It is not surprising that the Aesymneteship soon fell into disuse. It might not have done so if its power had been less, or if its tenure had been limited, like that of the Roman dictatorship, to six months. Pittacus surrendered it after holding it for ten years and retired into private life, but there were not many Greeks of his stamp, and there must always have been a risk of Aesymnetes declining to retire. Hence the Greek States allowed the office to disappear, and made shift with $\sigma \tau \rho a \pi \eta \gamma o i$ aùrokpáropes in its place. Indeed, the creation even of a sole $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma$ òs à̀rok $a^{\prime}$ т $\omega$ p was sometimes attended with peril to the State, for the risk of the establishment of a tyranny was always greater in Greece than at Rome. Still Greece probably lost something by allowing the Aesymneteship to fall into disuse. It was an office which in the hands of good men was a means of suppressing tyranny.
32. тท̂s $\beta \alpha_{\rho} \beta a \rho ı \kappa \eta ̂ s, ~ s c . ~ \mu о \nu а р \chi i a s . ~$
 of some definite time or the performance of some definite actions.'

 $\pi \rho о є є \sigma т \grave{k \kappa \sigma а у . ~}$
 Laertius based on Aristotle (2. 46 : Aristot. Fragm. 65. 1486 b 34) we find the form 'Avtunevious, which is the correct Lesbian form. He was a brother of Alcaeus, and another brother was named Kikts (Alcaeus, Fragm. 137), kîkus meaning 'strength,' so that the names of all the three brothers were indicative of strength and prowess. See note on risirb 29.
37. $\delta \eta \lambda$ oî $\delta^{\prime}$ 'A入каîos к.т..入. Aristotle evidently anticipates that his statement that Pittacus was elected tyrant by the Mytileneans will hardly be credited by his own contemporaries-an elective tyranny would seem to them to be a contradiction in terms-and he supports it with the strongest testimony he can find, that of the foe whom Pittacus was elected to put down. The fact would hardly have been forgotten if the songs of Alcaeus had not, like those of Simonides (Aristoph. Nub. 1353 sqq.), passed somewhat out of fashion. Alcaeus, however, can only have known of Pittacus' election by hearsay, for he was an exile when it took place. His scolion, or convivial song, was probably composed in the camp of
the exiles leagued against Mytilene, but it would not be long in finding its way into the city. It would be sung with most zest by others than the Mytileneans, for it satirized them as $\dot{\epsilon} \theta$ e 人 ódoviot, a grave reproach to Greeks (cp. Hdt. 3. 143 and 1. 62 sq., and Theogn. 847-850).
39. то̀v какота́трঠба Пıттакòv к.т.д. Alcaeus, Fragm. 37 A Bergk. There is a reference to this fragment in Eth. Nic. 9. 6.



 coniecisset, illud ipsum Schneidewin Alcaeo tribuit' (Bergk). The epithet какóтaт $\iota s$, 'born of a mean father,' is no doubt applied to Pittacus because his father was a Thracian and perhaps a slave. As to his Thracian extraction cp. Duris, ap. Diog. Laert. 1. 74: we see from Thuc. 4. ro7 that Pittacus was a Thracian name. Tòv какотátpıòa closes a line, and then follow two complete lines. In the second of these, 'Eбrágauro к.т...., the second syllable is long, but this syllable may be either long or short in this metre, and thus we are not obliged to regard the $a$ of Murrakós as long. Ahrens (De Graec. Ling. Dial. r. 246) accentuates חírraкov: he remarks ( I . Io), ' Grammatici uno ore testantur, Aeoles accentum in ultima acutum fugientes retraxisse in priores syllabas, exceptis tantummodo, ut accuratiores monent, praepositionibus et coniunctionibus.'

In place of mó̀és and ėmawéovtes Alcaeus probably wrote тódios (Ahrens, I. 116) and émaivevies (Ahrens, I. 142), but it is doubfful whether Aristotle did so in quoting his lines. Not much dependence can be placed on our MSS. in this matter, but it deserves notice that even when in citations from non-Attic writers they in the main preserve the dialect, as they do here-and this is often not the case (see for instance the quotation from Heraclitus in 7 (5). 11. 1315a 30 sq.)-they allow Attic forms to slip in : thus we have $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}$ ( not $\ddot{\epsilon} \sigma \lambda \omega \nu$ ) in the quotation from Sappho in Rhet. I. 9.1367 a 8 sqq., and Simonides may have written ä $\mu a \tau a$ and ка入́óotv in the passage (Fragm. 12) quoted from him in Hist. An. 5. 8. 542 b 7 sqq. See also critical note on 1340 b 26. 'Etai$\nu \in \nu \tau e s$ is not only the correct Lesbian form, but it is required by the metre, unless the third and fourth syllables of $\dot{\epsilon \pi a v e v} \dot{\sigma} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ can be regarded as coalescing. It may possibly be a technical word for the expression of assent to the election of a magistrate (cp. Alcacus,

 è $\left.\pi a v \eta \eta_{\tau} \tau \sigma \nu \nu\right)$, but see Bergk on this fragment.

ảxó $\lambda \omega$, 'meek,' ' lacking gall.' Compare [Demosth.] c. Aristog.

 from Plutarch by Eusebius, Praep. Evang. 3. I. 3 (referred to by

 also Aristoph. Lysistr. 463 ,



 Paroem. Gr. 2. III) is alluded to. Hamlet's 'I lack gall To make oppression bitter' is familiar.
2. аûtat $\mu$ ย̀v oûv к.т. $\lambda$. Aûtaı, 'these monarchies' (cp. aû่ 1285 a 18 and 6 (4). 10. 1295 a 14). Eioi perhaps refers to the barbarian Kingship (cp. I7, єi大i), and $\bar{\eta} \sigma a \nu$ to the Aesymneteship (cp. 30, $\hat{\eta}_{\nu}$ ). If so, the barbarian Kingship is here implied to have been elective, which we have not been told before, though we learn the fact in 6 (4). IO. I295 a I I sq.
4. тє́тартоу $\delta^{\prime}$ єídos к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle does not tell us whether he includes only Greek Kingships in this class, but probably this is his meaning, for he makes $\dot{\eta} \beta a \rho \beta a \rho \iota к \grave{\eta} \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ a ~ a ~ s e p a r a t e ~ k i n d . ~$ Kacà עó $\mu$ ov should be taken with $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota$ (' which arose in accordance with law in the heroic times, voluntary and hereditary in character'); these Kingships are said to arise in accordance with law, because they do not, like tyranny, owe their origin to the arbitrary action of an individual (compare the contrast of кaтà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 1286 b 3 r sqq.); they owe it, in fact, as is explained in the next sentence, to their subjects' gratitude for benefits conferred. Cp. 7

 the times of Heracles (Probl. 30. 1. 953 a 13 sq.) and Priam (Eth. Nic. I. 10. 1100 a 7 sq.). Thus Isocrates (Evag. § 65 ) calls the Trojan War 'the war of the heroes.' The 'heroic times' seem to come to an end before, or perhaps with, the Dorian invasion of the Peloponnese (Paus. 7. 17. 1, "Apyos $\mu$ è̀ 's $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau o \nu$




 $\nu$ ó $\mu$ ov by introducing an explanation in detail of the way in which this came about.
toùs $\pi \rho \omega \dot{\text { tous, }}$, the first kings of each dynasty,' 'the founders of dynasties.'

тои̂ $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \hat{\eta}^{\theta}$ ous єủєpyє́ras. The founders of the heroic Kingships won their thrones, according to Aristotle, by services to the people, just as it was the revolt of the people that overthrew Kingships (15). Thurot (Etudes sur Aristote, p. 84) has already pointed out that this account is hardly consistent with 7 (5). 10. 1310b 9 sq., where Kingship is said to have come into being for the protection of the $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \epsilon \kappa \epsilon i s$ from the demos. However, the origin of Kingship generally (including the Persian Kingship, for Cyrus is referred to) is traced in a very similar way in 7 (5). 10. 1310 b $3^{r}$ sqq. Aristotle refers the origin of Kingship to the will of the people, but the Kings themselves would probably claim that they owed their thrones to Zeus, from whom they sprang (see Schömann, Gr. Alt. I. 23).
7. katà $\tau$ éx $\mathbf{\nu} \alpha \mathbf{s}$, 'in connexion with arts.' Bernays translates 'by the invention of arts,' and no doubt services of this nature are especially present to Aristotle's mind, but the phrase is wide enough to include cases like that of Melampus, who was made joint-king of Argos with his brother and the previous King Anaxagoras for healing the Argive women of their madness (Paus. 2. 18.4). As to Kings who won their thrones by discoveries in connexion with the arts, we may compare the words of Atreus in Eurip. Fragm. 853,


where Nauck refers to Strabo, p. 23 (Polyb. 34. 1. 4 sqq.), кai







 compares Diod. I. 43. 6.
$\hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu \circ v$. Aristotle no doubt remembers the way in which Bellerophon came to be King of the Lycians (Hom. II. 6.189 sqq.).
 sense of 'forming into a $\pi$ ó $\lambda \iota s$ ' (cp. c. $6.127^{8}$ b 21 sq., Diod. 3 .

 30. 9, and Isocr. Hel. § 35), so that it answers to ктiซavtєs in 7 (5). 10. 13Iob 38. In Plato, Laws 681 C we have тоís $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu$ óть каì ảyaزoûनt toùs $\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{ous}$, oiò $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon \hat{v} \sigma \iota$. Cp. also Conon ap. Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 186. p. I3I а 23 Bekk., $\pi a \rho a \lambda a \beta \omega ̀ \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i ́ a \nu$

 ảmò тои̂ патрòs є́ $\pi о \nu о \mu a ́ \sigma a s . ~$
$\hat{\eta}$ торíal x $\boldsymbol{\omega} \rho a v . ~ S o ~ t h e ~ H e r a c l e i d a e, ~ b e i n g ~ h e i r s ~ t o ~ A r g o s, ~$ Lacedaemon, and Messene, made over their territories to their comrades in the invasion of Peloponnesus and received Kingships in return for them (Isocr. Archid. § 17 sqq. and especially § 20).



 who succeeded to them.' So Bern., 'und für die folgenden Geschlechter ward diess dann ein angestammtes Verhältniss.'
9. кúpıo七 $\delta^{\prime} \hat{\eta} \sigma \alpha \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle says nothing of the share of the Kings in deliberative authority as conveners of the $\gamma \in \rho o v \sigma i a$
 1272 a 9.
 the Kings passed to the $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i s$ or äp $p o \nu \tau \epsilon s$ or $\pi \rho v \tau a ́ v \epsilon t s$, as to whom see 8 (6). 8. 1322 b 26 sqq., and note on that passage. The Egyptian King was a priest according to Plato, Polit. 290 D sq.; not so the Greek King of heroic times. The sacrificial and juclicial prerogatives of early Greek Kings were no doubt sources of profit to them, and their military position would bring them plunder.
kaì mpòs roúrols ràs סíkas Ếkpıvov. Did the King try all the actions that were brought? If so, there cannot have been many of them, especially as the King would be from time to time absent
on campaigns．Gilbert（Beiträge zur Entwickelungsgeschichte des griech．Gerichtsverfahrens und des griech．Rechtes，p．445）thinks that in the earliest days of Greece the whole people sat in judge－ ment on offences affecting the collective interests．He infers this from the practice in historical times of the Macedonians（see note on 1285 a 16），the Epirots（Polyb．32． 21 Hultsch），and the Acarnanians（Liv．33．16）．But he holds that the right of trying these offences passed to the King in those States of Eastern Greece in which，as at Mycenae，a powerful Kingship came into existence， though the King may probably have exercised it with the advice of his $\gamma$ ү́ $\rho о \nu \tau \epsilon s$（p．446）．
 later than the heroic Greek judges and dicasts probably always adjudicated on oath（cp．Dion．Hal．Ant．Rom．7．47，ä̃a⿱⺌兀 $\delta \stackrel{\text { è }}{ }$
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \phi \epsilon \in \epsilon \iota \nu)$ ：the oath of the Athenian dicast is well known（see vol．i．p．273，note 1，and below on 1287 a 25）．Hence Aristotle＇s mention of the fact that some Greek Kings in the heroic times adjudicated unsworn．Those Kings who adjudicated on oath would no doubt swear to judge justly，and possibly to judge according to the laws．We must not assume that the Kings who adjudicated unsworn did not take an oath from time to time to rule according to the laws．The Lacedaemonian Kings swore to the Ephors every month that they would so rule（Xen．Rep． Lac．${ }^{5} 5.7$ ），but we do not hear of their adjudicating on oath， though they may have done so．Plutarch in Quaest．Rom． 44 speculates why the priest of Jupiter at Rome was not allowed to





 King we see from Soph．Fragm．428，

 $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu \tau \epsilon \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \psi \iota \nu$ кєís $\theta \epsilon o u ̀ s$ d́ $\mu a \rho \tau a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$.
The Athenians out of respect for Xenocrates would not allow him to give his testimony on oath（Cic．ad Att．I．16．4）．We have

'A $\theta$. Под. c. 3. 1. ir. See Liddell and Scott as to the use of ¿̇uvv́凶, and Meisterhans, Gramm. d. att. Inschr., ed. 2, p. 153 . See also note on 1324b 20 .
 before èmavítaots, as is often the case when the genitive comes first:


 ${ }^{1} 33 \mathrm{I}$ b 5 . 'Emaváragıs, not simply àváracıs, because the sceptre is lifted up in a particular direction. For the fact see Hom. Il. 7 . 412: 10. $3^{2 \mathrm{I}}$. Compare the oath of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 22, And Abram said to the king of Sodom, I have lift up mine hand unto the Lord, the most high God, the possessor of heaven and earth, that I will not take from (thee?) a thread even to a shoelatchet, and that I will not take anything that is thine). The lifting-up of the sceptre perhaps signified that the King staked his sceptre on the honesty of the judgement. No words needed to be uttered, no gods to be named; in both these respects the oath referred to differed from ordinary oaths, in which it was common to name three gods (C. F. Hermann, Gr. Ant. 2. § 2I. 9). Cp. Alexis, Fragm. Өŋтevooutes (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 420),

and Cratin. Xeif $\rho \nu \in$, Fragm. II (Meineke, 2. 155 ),


where see Meineke's note.
 which these Kingships came into being, but also far later times (see above on 1285 a 30 ). For äp $\chi \in \nu$ with the accusative of the matters over which rule is exercised, cp.c. 16.1287 a 9 , where $\Pi$ have äpXel пávra. If we read with all the MSS. (except $\mathrm{M}^{\text {s }}$, which omits the first $\tau a ́$, and $P^{1}$, which adds катá before êvòn $\mu a$ ) каi rà кат
 the first kai), we shall probably be right in translating, with Bernays, 'both matters in the city and matters in the territory and matters beyond the frontier,' though $\tau$ à évòn $\mu a$ usually means 'home-affairs,' and it would be possible to take it in this sense here, translating ' both matters in the city and home-affairs generally and matters beyond the frontier.' Those who strike out kai before $\tau \grave{a}$ катà $\pi \grave{\lambda} \iota \nu$ translate 'the affairs of the State, both home-affairs and affairs beyond
the frontier.' Tà kàà nồıv might probably mean 'the affairs of the State' (cp. Plato, Polit. 287 B, D, 295 E, 305 E, and see Holden

 used in this sense, $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ кađà $\pi \dot{\prime} \grave{\lambda} \iota \nu$ meaning rather ' matters in the city' in contradistinction to 'matters in the country': compare
 Cyneg. 13. 15, Plato, Theaet. 142 A and Rep. 475 D, and Menand. 'xòpía Fragm. i (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 207). If we are right then in taking rà karà $\pi \pi^{\prime} \lambda_{\iota \nu}$ in the sense of 'matters in the city,' the three-fold division in the passage before us will answer to that


 sqq.), who were annual officers.
üбтepov $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т.ג. As to the circumstances attending the fall of Kingship compare 7 (5). ro. 1312 b 38 sqq. and Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 5. 74, where Theophrastus is probably followed, as in the passage immediately preceding. Both Dionysius and Polybius (6. 7. 6-9) speak as if the Kingship of heroic Greece always passed into a tyranny before it fell (cp. Eth. Nic. 8. 12. 1160 b io sqq.), but we gather from the passage before us and from $7(5)$. 10.1312 b 40 sq. that this was not always the case.
 refers in the first place to Theseus (Plut. Thes. cc. 24, 25), but also to Theopompus the Lacedaemonian King (7 (5). 11. 1313a 26 sqq.) and to the Kings of the Molossians (1313 a 23 sqq.).
 the Kingship is commonly attributed by the authorities to oi $\pi$ oddoi




 of $\delta \delta \delta_{\mu \mu s}$ in 4.5. 10 and 2. 19. 2. Polybius also assigns the chief part in the overthrow of monarchy to the $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os (6.8. r), and so does Lucretius ( 5 . 1136 sqq.). Their view is confirmed by the fact that in the Achaean cities Kingship was succeeded by democracy (Polyb. 2. 4 r. 4 sq.). Aristotle speaks of Kingship as designed to protect the ėntetкeis from the $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu \mathrm{os}(7(5), 10.1310 \mathrm{~b} 9)$, and it is
natural that he should regard the Many as the agents in its overthrow. If we ask how it happened that, though Kingship was overthrown by the Many, it was nevertheless usually succeeded by the supremacy of the Few, Polybius has an answer ready; the Many effected the overthrow of Monarchy by means of $\pi \rho o \sigma \tau a ́ \tau a l$, and they allowed these $\pi \rho о \sigma \tau a ́ t a \iota ~ t o ~ r u l e ~ o v e r ~ t h e m ~(P o l y b . ~ 6 . ~ 8 . ~ I ~ s q) . ~ .$.
 ('A 1 . Под. c. 3 : Isocr. Areopag. § 29). The Kingship was reduced to priestly functions at Cyrene (Hdt. 4. 161) and Ephesus, where we read of the descendants of Androclus in Strabo, p. 633, кai ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \tau \iota$



20. $\mu \epsilon \hat{v} \nu$ oûv is taken up by $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \quad o \dot{v} \nu, 28$, and then answered by $\pi \epsilon ́ \mu \pi \tau o \nu ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda_{.}, 29$.
 Though the submission rendered to the heroic Kingship by its subjects was a willing submission, it was not unconditional. Aristotle conceives the heroic Kingship to have been granted to the Kings by the people on the condition that they should be generals and judges and supreme over matters relating to the gods. This form of $\nu о \mu \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \beta u \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a$ resembles $\nu о \mu \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \phi i \lambda i ́ a$ (Eth. Nic. 8. I5. 1162 b

24. ėk $\gamma \in ́ v o u s, ~ l i t e r a l l y ~ ' r e s u l t i n g ~ f r o m ~ f a m i l y, ' ~ ' b y ~ r i g h t ~ o f ~ f a m i l y . ' ~$ 'Ek here signifies the 'origo et causa' of the $\dot{a} \rho \chi \eta$ ' (Bon. Ind. 225 b
 үє́vous тотє̀ $\delta$ è aipєтoí. Elsewhere we have кatà $\gamma$ févos.
26. For $\tau \in \tau \alpha ́ \rho \tau \eta ~ \tau о u ́ \tau \omega \nu, ~ ' f o u r t h ~ o f ~ t h e s e ~ w h i c h ~ I ~ a m ~ e n u m e r-~$ ating,' cp. 2. II. 1272 b 28 , and see Vahlen on Poet. 3. 1448 a 19.
27. аüтๆ $\delta^{3}$ є̇бтіи к.т.入. Aristotle forgets that he has included under the Lacedaemonian type of Kingship not only hereditary but also elective Kingships (1285 a 15 : cp. also c. 15.128 万 b 39). His recapitulations are not always exact: see vol. i. Appendix B, and above on $125^{8}$ a 17 and 1278 a 34.
29. тє́ $\mu \pi т о \nu \delta^{3}$ єiठos к.т. $\lambda$. Пávt $\omega \nu$ is here neuter (though in c. 16.


 каі «іторр $\eta \boldsymbol{\tau} \omega$. It is characteristic of Monarchy to be supreme over
everything（Rhet．r．8． 1365 b 37 sq．），though all Kings were not so（ 1285 a 4）．Compare with Aristotle＇s language here the address of the Chorus to the King of the Argives in Aesch．Suppl． 370 sqq．
 of $\bar{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ with Buecheler，but Bernays seems right in following



30．T⿳⺈⿵人一 кotผิ̂v，＇public matters，＇as in c． 5.1278 b 4 （not＇public property，＇as Bern．）．
 household rule．＇Supply $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon$ éa from tî̀os $\beta$ ßaбìeias（cp．34）． Bonitz（Ind． 748 b 18 sqq．）explains tártetv here as used＇de notionum ordine logico，＇and refers among other passages to 7 （ 5 ）．


 with тò karà tò cìvaı тєтаүнévov．
 the rule over a household is a kind of Kingship（see above on 1278 b 37 ），Aristotle is thinking of the relation of the father to his children，not of that of the husband to his wife or of the master to his slaves．
 of ßaoideia，but Aristotle speaks of the fifth kind of Kingship simply as Kingship（cp．тク̀ $\beta$ ßaбi九eiav，c． 16.1287 b 35），because it is


C．15． 33 sqq．Aristotle seems to take it for granted that if he discovers whether the two extreme forms are expedient or not，he will have solved the question of the expediency of the intermediate forms．In just the same way Hippocrates in his treatise De Aere，Aquis，Locis sketches the extreme variations of the human race under the influence of climate and region，closing the treatise with the words，

 also have felt that a discussion of the expediency of the heroic Kingship and the Aesymneteship would have only an historical， and a discussion of the expediency of the barbarian Kingship only a scientific，interest for Greeks．

35．T⿳⺈⿵人一口 ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ai $\pi$ ro $\lambda \lambda \alpha i$ ．Aristotle probably refers to the heroic

Kingship and possibly also to the barbarian Kingship, for the power of the Aesymnete seems to have been quite unbounded.
 this sentence cp. 5 (8). 5. 1339 b 35 sqq. and see note on I 332 b 42 .

тท̂s $\pi \alpha \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a s$, literally ' Kingship over everything' (cp. $\pi a \mu-$ $\mu \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho=\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \eta \rho$ ), as we see from c. 16.1287 a 8 sqq. It would seem from the expression $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi a \mu \beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon i a s ~ к а \lambda o v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta s, ~ 1287 ~ a ~ 8, ~$ and from the absence of any remark in the passage before us, that the word was not coined by Aristotle, as Schneider thinks, but was a recognized Greek word. Пaرßaбı入єús does not occur in Aristotle's writings, though it occurs in soфia $\Sigma \in \iota \rho a x^{2} 50$. I5 and in C.I. G. 4725. 6 (Liddell and Scott).

 family' is opposed to tenure 'by turns,' because tenure 'by turns' makes the office accessible to all, not indeed simultaneously but successively. Tenure 'by turns' is a wider term than tenure 'by election,' because, when tenure 'by turns' is the rule, the dignity may pass by election or it may not.
2. Tò $\mu$ èv oûv к.т. ., 'now to inquire as to the kind of Generalship 1286 a. we have mentioned is to enter on an inquiry belonging in species rather to inquiries respecting laws than to inquiries respecting constitutions.' The inquiry started by Aristotle in c. 14. 1284 b 35 sqq. is an inquiry respecting Kingship as a constitution (cp. 1284 b 39, $\hat{\eta}$ ov̉, $\left.\dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }_{a} \lambda \lambda \eta \eta \tau \iota s \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i \alpha \alpha \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu\right)$. So too in 3. I. 1274 b 32 it is taken for granted that the subject for consideration is the constitution: cp. 6 (4). 8. 1293 b 29, $\dot{\eta} \mu \hat{\imath} \nu ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \theta o \delta o \nu$


 roúrav є́ariv. Notwithstanding what he says here, Aristotle describes in 7 (5). r. 1 3 ○r b 17 sqq. an attempt to abolish the Lacedaemonian Kingship as an attempt to alter 'a part of a constitution.'
 on that passage.
 and 1291 a 16 , and cp. 6 (4). 2. 1289 b 25, where $\tau a \hat{\tau} a$ refers to $\phi \theta o p a i$ and $\sigma \omega \tau \eta p i a t$.

5．$\check{\omega} \tau \tau^{3}$ áфєíaө $\omega$ тク̀ $\nu \pi \rho \omega \dot{\tau} \eta \nu$ ．Aristotle evidently intended to treat of laws some time or other ：cp． 6 （4）．1． 1289 a II sqq．

7．ápXŋ̀ $\delta^{\prime} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \sigma \boldsymbol{\tau}$ к．т．ג．This is the initial inquiry；it is followed by the further inquiries，$\tau i \sigma \iota \sigma v \mu \phi \hat{\epsilon} \rho \epsilon \iota$ кaì $\pi \omega ิ s$（c．17． 1288 a 30 sq ．）． The question whether the rule of men or of law is best was as old as the time of Pittacus，if we may trust Diod．9．27．4 and Diog． Laert．1． 77 （see above on 128 r a 34），and of Solon，to judge by Plut．Solon，c．14，$\pi 0 \lambda \lambda o i ̀ ~ \delta e ̀ ~ к a i ̀ ~ \tau \omega ̂ \nu ~ \delta i a ̀ ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \sigma o v ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ v i \pi o ̀ ~ \lambda o ́ y o v ~$

 opinion had long decided the question in favour of law；it identified Democracy with the rule of law and Monarchy and Oligarchy with the rule of persons（vol．i．p．494，note），and it is in this spirit that Theseus speaks as the representative of Democracy in Eurip．Suppl． 415 sqq．Bothe（ 429 sqq．Dind．）：cp．also Hyperid．Or．Fun．col．9．
 The teaching of Socrates，however，gave new life to the discussion． No one rendered a more willing obedience to the laws than he，yet his view that he who knows is the true ruler，and that a parallel exists between the ruler of a State and the master of an art， furnished Monarchy，or at any rate Monarchy in the hands of a scientific ruler，with a fresh ground of claim．For what master of an art would be prepared to fetter his practice of his art by written rule？It does not appear that Socrates himself ever raised this question，but his views undoubtedly suggested those to which Plato gives expression in Polit． 294 A sqq．and Laws 874 E sqq．See as to Plato＇s views vol．i．p． 270 sqq．Aristotle in his first inquiry on the subject，contained in c． 15 ，is led，after a brief discussion（1286a 9－2I）of the question whether the best man or the best laws should rule，to suggest a compromise－let the best man promulgate laws and let laws rule except where they deviate from what is right，or in other words let the best man rule in subjection to law，except where right requires that he shall overrule law．But at the beginning of c． 16 Aristotle discovers that a ruler in this position would not be an Absolute King，whereas it is the claims of Absolute Kingship that he has promised to examine． Hence the compromise has to be abandoned and a fresh inquiry into the subject undertaken in c． 16 with the result that law should rule in some cases and the One Best Man in others．

9．Soкоû́九 $\delta$ ŋ̀̀ к．т．入．Cp．Plato，Polit． 294 A sqq．Aristotle
agrees that the law from its inevitable generality is unable to regulate some things and fails to regulate others well ( 1286 a 24 ), even when the utmost possible degree of ákpißeca is imparted to it. Cp. Eth. Nic. 5. 14. 1 137 b 13 -32: Pol. 2. 8. 1269 a 9 sqq.: 3. 1 1. 1282 b i-6: 3 . 15.1286 a 36 sq.: Rhet. I. 13 . 1374 a 18 sqq. Law is said in c. 16.1287 b 22 to be unable to regulate things about which men deliberate. For $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ r a ̀ ~ \pi \rho o \sigma \pi i n t т o v t a ~ e ̀ m ı r u ́ r \tau \epsilon t \nu ~ c p . ~ X e n . ~ C y r o p . ~$

12. For äpxєьp, used of the master of an art, cp, c. 6. 1279 a 4 sq.

каi év Aiyúntẹ к.т.ג., 'and in Egypt it is permissible for the physicians to change' (i.e. to depart from) 'the rules of treatment prescribed by law after four days' treatment, while if a physician does this before, he does it at his peril.' Bonitz (Ind. 391 a 7 ) is probably right in supplying roùs $\gamma$ єүрад $\mu$ évous עóभovs with ktveiv, unless indeed we should rather supply đà $\gamma \rho \dot{a} \mu \mu a \tau a$ from 12 . With $\mu \epsilon \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon \tau \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho o \nu$ Prof. Postgate (Notes, p. 7) supplies $\mu \epsilon \lambda \in ́ \tau \eta \nu$ : perhaps, however, $\theta$ epareial is the word which is suppressed (cp.

 фìous notov̀rau (oi $\mu$ óvap $\chi o t$ ) covápXovs, and Eth. Nic. 3. 1. IIroa 9,










 quvetarépous. The authority followed by Diodorus does not seem to have been aware that the physicians in Egypt were free after four days to depart from the treatment prescribed by law, if desirable. The reason why they were allowed to do so may have been that a crisis in the disease was thought to occur on the fourth day: cp.

 See also Hippocr. De Morb. 4. vol. ii. p. 347 sqq. Kühn, where the
writer explains that the crisis in fevers occurs on days uneven in number, the third, fifth, seventh, or ninth, and adds, $\mu \in \theta_{i \epsilon \iota} \delta \dot{\epsilon} \tau o ̀ ~ \pi \hat{v} \rho$

 agrees with that of the passage just quoted from the History of Animals. Or the view may have been that the full effect of the drugs administered would not be experienced by the patient till the third day: see Hippocr. De Morb. 4. vol. ii. p. 34 I Kühn.
16. $\delta i \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ aủtŋ̀v aitiav, for the same reason for which $\dot{\eta}$ кaтà
 the $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu а т а$ каі̀ дó $\mu о \iota$ may be unsuitable in the given case.
$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. This is the rejoinder of an advocate of law. ' But yet [if it is made an objection to law that it embodies an universal principle,] that universal principle too [no less than other things] must be possessed by the rulers, [so that their sway is open to the same objection, ] and that from which the affective element is wholly absent is better than that in which it is innate. Now the affective element finds no place in the law, whereas every human soul must have it. [Hence the law is a better ruling authority than a man.]' Kảkєîvov rò̀ $\lambda$ óyov тòv каӨódov takes up ro, rò каӨôлоv нóvò $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$. That without ó kaOódov 入óyos a ruler cannot rule


 Princ. Inerud. c. 3, тís oủv ảp $\xi \in \iota$ тov̂ ảpХоขтоs; ó עó $\rho$ оs, ó $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$



 Plato, Laws 713 E sqq. As to tò $\pi a \theta \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v$ see above on 1254 b 8, and compare c. 16.1287 a 28 sqq ., where $\tau$ ò $\pi a \theta \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v$ is represented



 Cyrop. 1. 3. 18, кaì ó бòs $\pi a \tau \grave{\eta} \rho \pi \rho \omega ̂ \tau o s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon \tau a \gamma \mu \epsilon ́ v a ~ \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu ~ \pi o เ \epsilon i ̂ ~ \tau \eta ̂ ̀ ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota, ~$
 'A $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i \nu \eta \nu$ is probably added because the proposal was to put a man in the place of the law.
20. avrì roúrou, perhaps rather 'in return for this' than 'in
compensation for this' ('pro eo quod affectibus non caret,' Bon. Ind. 63 a 57 ). The presence of an affective element in the individual human being is the price he pays for his deliberating


 here follows in the track of Plato, Polit. 295 D-E, 300 C. He draws the provisional conclusion that it will be best to have a Lawgiver-King content in general to leave supremacy to the law which he has made, but ready to overrule it when it is well that he should do so. (Compare c. 11. 1282 b i sqq., where a similar arrangement is suggested.) Plutarch describes in Ages. c. 30 , how Agesilaus after Leuctra, seeing how numerous those were who had lost courage in the battle (oi i $\tau$ 白 $\sigma a \nu \tau \epsilon s$ ), advised that the laws which imposed a severe form of $\mathfrak{a} \tau \mu \dot{a}$ in such cases should 'sleep for a while.' Aristotle, however, goes much further than this, and asks that his Lawgiver-King shall overrule the law not only in critical times, but whenever it deviates from the right. We may compare the powers of overruling law possessed by the Roman Senate, and afterwards by the Emperor, even before the Principate became an Absolute Monarchy (Mommsen, Röm. Staatsrecht, 2.823 sqq. , ed. x ), and also the dispensing power of the Popes and the English Kings (Macaulay, Hist. of England, c. 6). Cowell in the earlier editions of his 'Interpreter, or Law Dictionary,' writing in the reign of James $I$, who found it necessary to suppress the work by proclamation, said under the title 'King,' 'And though at his coronation he take an oath not to alter the laws of the land, yet, this oath notwithstanding, he may alter or suspend any particular law that seemeth hurtful to the public estate' (Hallam, Const. Hist. of England, c. 6). It must be borne in mind that the King whom Aristotle would invest with powers of this nature is ex hypothesi an àvìp äptacos.
 ü $\rho \chi \in \boldsymbol{\prime})$. Kpivesv, 'to decide,' as in 6 (4). 4. 1292 a 29.
 34, त́áves . . qvvè Aóvtess). Kpivovaıv, 'come to decisions.' Both judicial and deliberative decisions are probably referred to, whereas in C. II. 128r b 3 I, 6 (4). 4. 1291 b 5, and 4 (7).9. 1329a 4 крivelv refers only to the former. The point of the addition, aîrat $\delta^{\circ}$ ai

after т $\bar{\omega} \nu \kappa \pi \theta^{\prime}$ ' є́кабтоע the words 'which are just the things that the law cannot deal with.'
28. $\mu \grave{v} v$ oûv, 'true.' This passage seems to be based on C. II. 1281 a 42 sqq.
 many individuals, [and therefore is better than any single individual].' Cp.c. II. 1282 a 38 sq.
 of $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau t a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s$, and it is compound, not $\dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta}$.

Sıà тои̂то. For the asyndeton cp. 6 (4). II. 1295 b 33, סıà тои̂то



 oủX ó óíms $\lambda$ е́ $\gamma$ оута.

каi крiveı ä $\mu$ єıvov, 'also decides better' [besides being better].
 only arrives at better decisions than a single individual or a few, but is also less likely to be led astray from the just conclusions at which it arrives. For the structure of the sentence see above

 $\delta \epsilon \eta{ }^{\eta} \sigma \sigma \iota \quad \delta \iota \kappa a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$, where the word is explained in Bekk. Anecd. 1. p. 343 by тò $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi а р а к \epsilon к \iota \nu \eta \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o \nu ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ o ̉ \rho \theta \hat{\eta} s \gamma^{\nu} \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{s}$ (see Stallbaum on the passage). For the thought, ср. 'А $\theta . ~ П о \lambda . ~ с . ~ 4 I, ~ к а i ̀ ~ \tau о и ิ т о ~$
 $\kappa[a i]$ кє́ $\rho \delta \epsilon \iota \kappa[a i] \chi \alpha ́ \rho \iota \sigma \iota \nu$, and Bryce, American Commonwealth, 2. 78 , 'The legislator can be "got at," the people cannot... The legislator may be subjected by the advocates of women's suffrage or liquor-prohibition to a pressure irresistible by ordinary mortals, but the citizens are too numerous to be all wheedled or threatened.' Yet the Constitution of the United States looks, and not in vain, to the President to act as a check on the tendency of Congress 'to yield to pressure from a section of its constituents or to temptations of a private nature' (Bryce, I. 75 sq.).
33. тoû $\delta^{\prime}$ évòs k.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle has just been pleading that the decisions of a multitude are less easily seduced by the wrongful influence of others than those of one man, and now he goes on to plead that they are less easily warped by internal passion. Sus. reads ráp e conj. in place of $\delta$, which is the reading of $\Gamma \Pi$, but not,

I think，rightly．When a whole people did come to be mastered by anger，to appease it was impossible；the only thing possible was to let its anger have full course in the hope that it would exhaust itself after a time（Eurip．Orest． 678 sqq．Bothe， 696 sqq． Dindorf）．


 1286 b 3 I sq．Aristotle evidently connects the overriding of law with the rule of a $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta_{0}$ of the kind which bears sway in extreme democracies（6（4）．4．1292 a 15,23 sqq．： 6 （4）．6． 1293 a 1 sqq．）， a $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os including other elements than oi $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \epsilon^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \rho o \iota(6$（4）．6．1292 b $3^{8}$ sqq．）．

38．єỉ $\delta \grave{\text { è }} \delta \grave{\eta}$ к．т．入．Toûto，＇this abstinence from overriding of the law．＇A high degree of virtue is not attainable by the Many（c． 7. 1279 a 39 sqq．： 4 （7）．II．I330 b 39）．＇A $\lambda \lambda^{\prime}$＇$\epsilon i \pi \lambda \epsilon$ ious к．т．$\lambda$ ．，＇still if there were a plurality of persons good both as men and as citizens．＇This is the characteristic of true dóotoкратia（6（4）．7． 1293 b 5 sq．）．For ả入入á cp．c．5． 1278 a 9.

1．à $\lambda \lambda$ ’ oi $\mu \epsilon ิ \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．As Giph．points out（p．395），this view is 1286 b． implied in the argument of Darius in favour of Monarchy（Hdt．3． 82）：compare also the answer of Alexander to the proposal of Darius to share the Persian Kingship with him（Diod．17．54．5）． In the quaint story preserved in Stob．Floril．ro． 50 Aristotle hints that even in an individual the right side may fall out with the left． And if the One Man does escape internal discord，his rule may nevertheless be productive of $\sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \iota s$ ，for others will be apt to fall out with him（Xen．Anab．6．1．29）．

2．ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Good men do not fall out among themselves（Eth． Nic．8．4．II 56 b II sq．）．$\Sigma \pi o v \delta a i ̂ o t ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$, cp．Thuc．2．40．5．

3．єỉ $\delta \grave{\eta}$ к．т．入．This is suggested by Plato，Rep． $445 \mathrm{D}, \epsilon^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu 0-$
 $\pi \lambda \epsilon \iota o ́ v \omega \nu$ ס̀̀ ápıттократía．（Contrast the account given of ápıбтократia in Plato，Polit． 301 A．）Aristotle is speaking aporetically in the passage before us．It is not his deliberate view that Kingship differs from Aristocracy in being the rule of one good man，while Aristocracy is the rule of several．The true King is one who surpasses in virtue and political capacity all the rest of the citizens put together．No such superiority is possessed by the individual rulers of an Aristocracy．
6. каì $\mu \in \tau \alpha ̀$ §uvá $\mu \epsilon \omega s$ к.т. $\lambda$., 'both when the Kingly office is accompanied with a bodyguard and when it is not.' It was a drawback to Kingship that it usually involved a bodyguard, and Aristotle says that Aristocracy would be better than Kingship, even if the King had no bodyguard. That Kingship is an ảp $\dot{\eta} \dot{q}$, we see from 7 (5). го. 1313 a 8.
7. каì סıà тоиิто к.т. $\lambda .$, 'and it was perhaps only owing to this that,' etc. 'Only' is often left unexpressed by Aristotle: see above on 1282 a $3^{6}$ and $b_{4}$. The account of the succession of constitutions given in the passage which commences here is aporetic only, and is not in agreement with Aristotle's deliberate opinion on the subject. A quite different account is given in 6 (4). 13 . 1297 b 16 sqq., where constitutional changes are connected with changes in the art of war ; indeed, in the criticism of Plato which is 'tacked on ' (see vol.i. p. $5^{1} 9$, note) at the close of the Book on Revolutions ( 7 (5). 12. r3r6 a r sqq.) Aristotle seems to deny that there is any regular succession of constitutions (1316 a 20 sqq.). The object of the review here given of the succession of constitutions appears to be to show that the days of Kingship were long past, and that it was in place only when States were small and a few much surpassed the rest in virtue. When States became larger, its place was naturally taken, first by an equal constitution, and then by degenerate forms of this ending in democracy, and when they became larger still, democracy came to be the only constitution which could easily be introduced.
8. For $\sigma \pi$ ávsov with the infinitive see Liddell and Scott.
 to mean 'States,' not 'cities': see notes on 20 and r3robi7. It is implied in the latter passage that States were small when Kingship prevailed.
 quence of benefit conferred, and benefits are the work of good men, [and good men were then rare].' 'A $\pi o ́$ in $\dot{a}^{\prime} \pi^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon \sigma i a s ~ m a r k s ~ t h e ~$ 'origo et causa' (Bon. Ind. 77 b 5 I sqq.). For the fact, cp .7 (5). 10. I3Iob ro sqq. That benefits are the work of good men is

 aja日óv. In an inscription found at Lycosura and published by



Complimentary decrees declaring individuals èvep $\boldsymbol{\text { étaı }}$ often speak of them as ävip̊es ciranoi (see e. g. Hicks, Greek Historical Inscriptions, No. 92 and No. 138 , line 40 ).
 by Kings], but sought for something shared in common by all, and established a constitution.' Cp. Plato, Polit. 301 C (quoted on




 before us that the constitution established after the fall of Kingship was one which gave supreme power to 'many' (cp. 12, $\pi$ o $\lambda$ doùs
 it was an oligarchy of knights. For кoıvóv $\tau \iota$, cp.c. $3.1276 \mathrm{~b} \mathbf{~}$, єї $\boldsymbol{\tau} \epsilon \rho$


 60) Pol. 6 (4). I r. 1296a 29 sqq. In the passage before us, as often elsewhere when the object is easily supplied, 'accusativus eius rei, quam quis ímoц́ével, omittitur' (see Bon. Ind. 800 b 6 r , where Hist. An. 9. 12. 615 b I8 is referred to among other passages). It is indeed quite in Aristotle's way to suppress the accusative governed by a verb: see below on 18 , and see note on 1273 b 18 . Here, as in the Seventh (Fifth) Book, Monarchies, or at any rate Kingships, are marked off from Constitutions (see vol. i. p. 52 I and vol. ii. p. xxvii).

 $\pi \lambda$ oùrov will be clearer if we translate 'for they made wealth [and not virtue] the honoured thing.' In an aristocracy virtue should be honoured above wealth, if it is to be durable (2. 11. 1273 a
 see from Eurip. Fragm. 628,


Cp. also Plato, Rep. 564 D.
18. ék $\delta$ §̀ toútшv к.т.ג. Plato in the Republic ( 555 B sqq.) had made oligarchy pass into democracy and democracy into tyranny, but Aristotle here makes oligarchy pass into tyranny and tyranny
into democracy，ingeniously suggesting that tyranny is an intensi－ fication of oligarchy，both these constitutions resting on a sordid love of gain（cp． 7 （5）．rо．1з 1 а 8 sqq．），but differing in this that tyranny claims for one man what oligarchy claims for a few（cp． 8 （6）．3．1318 a 22 sqq．）．Oligarchy did often pass into tyranny （7（5）．12．1316 a 34 sqq．），and tyranny into democracy（1316 a $3^{2}$ ）， but in $7(5)$ ．12．1316 a 20－39 Aristotle appears to reject anything like a fixed succession of constitutions．We are also there told that constitutions less often change into cognate forms than into opposite forms（ 1316 a 18 sqq．），so that we do not expect oligarchy often to pass into the cognate form，tyranny．
17．T⿳⺈⿵人一 tupavvi $\delta \omega v$ ．The article is added because tupavvías precedes in 16．For other instances of the same thing see 4 （7）．
 каì тoùs ảpхoبévous）， 5 （8）．7．1341 b $3^{8}$ sq．， 6 （4）．4．1290 b $3^{6,}$ 6 （4）．II． 1295 a 37， 6 （4）．12．1296 b 33， 7 （5）．8．1308 b 22 sq．，etc．

18．aíei $\gamma$ àp к．т．入．For the omission of the object of äyoutes see


 For the risks attaching to the exclusion of a large number of citizens from office see above on $\mathbf{1 2 8 1} \mathrm{b} 28$ ．For ioxupóтepov tò $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os


20．èmei $\delta \dot{\text { ® }}$ к．т．．．．，＇but now that States have come to be even larger［than they were when it first happened that many were alike in virtue］，perhaps it is no longer even easily possible，［much less suitable to the circumstances，］for any other constitution than


 Sus．and Welldon），not＇cities＇（as Bernays），because the words must apparently bear the same meaning as in 10，where I render тódets＇States．＇Cp． 6 （4）．6．1293 a 1 sqq．， 6 （4）．13．1297 b 22， and $7(5)$ ．ro． $1310 \mathrm{~b}_{17} \mathrm{sq}$ ．Compare also Isocr．Areopag．§ 62 ， where the word $\pi$ ódect seems to mean＇States，＇not＇cities．＇In ［Demosth．］c．Neaer．c． 75 it is not clear whether $\dot{\eta}$ mó̀ts means＇the State＇or＇the city．＇In 7 （5）．5．1305 a 18 sqq．tàs módets evidently



 descendants generally（cp．Thuc．r．126．12，13）．

25．кúptos $̈ ้$ ，＇although he has the power to do so．＇
26．ả $\lambda \lambda^{\lambda}$ о озкє́тเ к．т．$\lambda .$, ＇but here we reach a statement which it is no longer easy to believe，＇＇here we pass the point at which belief is easy．＇For oủкย́т cp． 4 （7）．3．1325 b 3 sqq．Aristotle＇s friend Antipater，however，refrained on his deathbed from passing on his regency to his son Cassander and appointed Polysperchon，who was not related to him，regent instead（Diod．18．48． 4 ：Thirlwall， Hist．of Greece，7．238）．Marcus Aurelius，on the other hand， shrank from excluding his son Commodus from the succession， ＇and his weakness must reflect strongly on his memory．He may have judged，indeed，that the danger to the State from a bad prince was less than the danger from a disputed succession，especially in the face of the disasters accumulating around it＇（Merivale，Hist．of the Romans under the Empire，8．348）．Giphanius（p．397）thinks that Aristotle is led by the difficulties which he raises in the passage before us to reject hereditary Monarchy altogether，but this is not the case，for he believes in the existence of families in which surpassing virtue is hereditary，and in their case he approves of hereditary Monarchy（c．17． 1288 a 15 sqq．）．

27．ĚXєı $\delta$＇ảmopiav к．т．入．，＇there is matter for debate，again，in the question with respect to the bodyguard also［as well as in that with respect to the children］，whether，＇etc．＂EXє九 is here used impersonally：see Bon．Ind． 305 b 31 sqq．，where Phys．I．2．I 85 b
 $\mu$ épos kaì тò ö ö ov，is referred to．The Lacedaemonian Kings had a bodyguard（Isocr．Epist．2．§ 6），and in Hom．Il．I． 324 Aga－ memnon says of Achilles，

31．$\mu \eta \delta \grave{\varepsilon} \nu \pi \rho \alpha ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$ к．т．ג．Cp． 1286 a 36 sq．and Dion．Hal．Ant．
 8七oıкои́ขт $\omega \nu$ ．

34．$\mu \hat{e} \nu$ oûv is answered by $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$, c．16． 1287 a 1 ．

 irxúv，but＇interdum non ei additur vocabulo in quo vis oppositionis VOL．III．
cernitur' (Bon. Ind. 454 a 20, where 6 (4). $5 \cdot 1292$ b 12 sqq. is referred to: cp. also 6 (4). 4.1292 a 32 sqq.).
36. $\boldsymbol{\omega} \sigma \tau є$ к.т. $\lambda$. For the suppression of $\epsilon i v a u$, see Vahlen on Poet. 24. 1459 b 7 , where reference is made to Poet. 15.1454 a 34 ,
 $\pi \rho a ́ т \tau \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\eta}$ ảעayкaîo $\hat{\eta}$ єikós (sc. єival). See also notes on 1277 a $3^{8}$ and 1327 a 34.
ékáatou kaì évòs kaì бu $\mu \pi \lambda$ єtóval. Cp. Plato, Laws $93^{2} \mathrm{C}$, єis

 the same thing as $\tilde{\varepsilon} v a \tilde{\varepsilon}$ éaotov. No other instance of the occurrence of the word $\sigma v \mu \pi \lambda$ eioves in Aristotle's writings is given in the Index Aristotelicus, and it is an extremely rare word. छú $\mu \pi 0 \lambda \lambda o \iota$ occurs in Plato, Polit. 26r E and elsewhere.
37. тoû $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ ous, 'the whole body of citizens': cp. 4 (7). 6. 1327 b


каӨवंтєр к.т.入., 'after the fashion in which the ancients granted bodyguards, whenever they set up one whom they called Aesymnete or tyrant of the State.' Bonitz (Ind. 779 b 52 ) is probably right in
 and not taking тúpavvov with kaӨıбтaî̀v. As to oi ápxaîo see above on 1285 a 30 . For öтє каӨเซтaîєv, ' whenever they set up,' cp. 7 (5). 5. 1305 a 7, 21 . The contrast with ${ }_{0 \text { ö }} \tau^{\prime} \eta$ ク̈ $\tau \epsilon \iota$ illustrates Eucken's remark (De Partic. Usu, p. 67), ' ${ }^{\text {öt }} \boldsymbol{\text { e }}$ utrum cum indicativo an cum optativo ponatur, ab Aristotele accurate distinguitur.'


1287 a. Aristotle is thinking of a King like the King of the Persians (Hdt.


4. каӨámєр єі้то $\mu \in v$, in c. 15 . 1286 а 2 sqq.
 крaтia shows that a perpetual, and indeed an hereditary, generalship might exist in an ápıбтокрatia. Perpetual magistracies were also not unknown in democracies, though the tendency there was to clip their wings (8 (6). 2. 1317 b 41 sqq.). As to Thessaly, cp. Diod.

 of Holland, as to whom see Lord Macaulay, Hist. of England, c. 2. 'The Stadtholder,' he says, 'commanded the forces of the common-
wealth, disposed of all military commands, had a large share of the civil patronage, and was surrounded by pomp almost regal.'
 one man supreme over the internal administration of the State' the opposite province to that of a perpetual general-and thus virtually constitute a Kingship according to law of a different kind. $\Delta$ toiknots is here opposed to $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma i a$, as Sus. ${ }^{3}$ (Index s.v.) has already pointed out: cp. Isocr. Panath. § 128, каі̀ каитà по́лєноу каі̀

 Cp. also Deinarch. c. Demosth. c. 97 , Tòv $\mu \hat{e} \nu$ èv $\tau \alpha i ̂ s ~ \pi o \lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \kappa a i ̂ s$
 ${ }^{\text {ä }}$ p $\quad$ бтоу. As to Epidamnus, cp. 7 (5). r. 1301 b 25 . Epidamnus and Opus were both of them oligarchical States (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 39 sqq., 236). Some oligarchies went further and placed the greatest offices-both military and civil, it would seemin the hands of one man ( $7(5)$. 10. I310 b 22). Pharsalus was probably an oligarchy when it placed the administration in the hands of Polydamas (Xen. Hell. 6. 1. 2, oûros $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ кaì $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$ ả $\lambda \lambda \eta$



 the same tendency is traceable even in democracies. For instance,
 (Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 248). This important office, however, to judge by the silence of the ' $A \theta \eta$ $\nu a i \omega \nu$ Пюлıтeia, did not exist at the time when this treatise was written (Gilbert, ibid.), and very possibly did not come into existence till after Aristotle's death. A multiplicity of magistrates ( $\dot{\eta}$ modvapxia), with the attendant 'circumlocution' and rivalries, often did harm to Greek States, as we can judge from Xen. Anab. 6. I. 18 and Plut. Camill. c. 18 , and they often gained by placing power in the hands of one man, thus anticipating on a small scale the experience of the Romans in relation to the Empire.
7. kaì $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{p}$ 'Emíסauvov, 'at Epidamnus for instance' (see above

 to a certain smaller extent': cp. Plato, Laws $757 \mathrm{D}, \epsilon \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \mu^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau$


 $\psi \nu \chi \hat{\eta} s \gamma^{\prime} \notin 0 \nu \epsilon:$ Diog．ap．Stob．Floril．9．49，oủ yà $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho a ́ \sigma \epsilon \tau a \iota ~ a u ́ t o ̀ \nu ~$
 that the office at Opus referred to is that of the dapoos mentioned in an inscription（Hicks，Greek Historical Inscriptions，No．63， p．II8），but this is uncertain．The office of кобдо́то入ıs，to which Sus．${ }^{2}$ ，Note 67 I（Sus．${ }^{4}$ ，I．p．439），takes Aristotle to refer，existed at the Epizephyrian Locri（Polyb．12．16．6，9），but we do not know that it existed among the Opuntian Locrians．
 the mark of a lacuna after ó $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \epsilon$ ús， $\mathbf{1 0}$ ，but not，it would seem， rightly，for a sentence constructed in a very similar way occurs in





9．äpxє $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} v \tau \alpha$, cp．c． 14.1285 b 13 sq．
10．氏́autoû．In 1287 a 1 all MSS．have av́roû（except those which have wrongly av̉rov̂），and this form＇longe frequentius apud Aristotelem exhibetur＇（Bon．Ind． 21 I b 45）．In 6 （4）．10． 1295 a ${ }_{1} 7$ all MSS．have кacà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu a v ̉ \tau \omega \bar{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \mu \eta \nu$ ．
oủరè katà фúvtv，＇not even natural，＇much less expedient，and the question raised at the commencement of c．I4 was whether Kingship is expedient．Cp．Eurip．Fragm． 172 （from the＇A $\nu \tau \iota \gamma o ́ \nu \eta$ ），
 тúpavyò єỉval $\mu \omega \rho i ́ a ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ каі̀ $\theta \epsilon ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ ， ôs $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ ó $\mu o i \omega \nu$ ßoú入єтal кратєì $\mu o ́ v o s . ~$
11．For êva $\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \omega v$ see note on 128 I a 13 ．


 sentence see above on 1253 b 35－37．Goettling and Sus．add кai e conj．before oũt $\omega$ s，but without necessity．The pleonastic addi－ tion of $\tau o i \nu v \nu$ in the apodosis， $\mathbf{I} 6$（ $\Pi^{1}$ omit it，but in all probability wrongly），is quite Aristotelian（see $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ ṽ $\pi \nu$ ро каi є́ $\gamma \rho \eta \gamma \dot{\rho} \rho \sigma \epsilon \omega s 2$. 455 a $12-26$ and Bonitz，Aristotel．Studien，2． 72 sq．），no less than the similar use of oû in the apodosis，as to which see Bon．Ind． 540 b 55 sqq．and Bonitz，Aristot．Stud．2． 59 sqq．＂EXєוข is to be supplied with tò ävıoov roùs äซous in 16 ．
$\tau \rho \circ \emptyset \eta े \nu \hat{\eta} \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \eta ิ \tau \alpha$. As to $\tau \rho \circ \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$, Mr. Broughton has already referred to Eth. Nic. 2. 5. IIO6 a 36 sqq. (cp. also Plato, Laws $691 \mathrm{C})$. As to $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta \hat{\eta} \tau a$, a big man in a small garment would suffer physically from cold, and a small man in a large garment from heat.
16. $\delta$ เо́тєр к.т. $\lambda$. Cp.2.2.1261 а 32 sqq. The subject of ä $\rho \chi є \iota \nu$ is rov̀s ioous supplied from the preceding sentence.
 Phileb. 26 B and Laws 673 E. Cp. 4 (7). 4. 1326 a 29.

тòv ăpa vó $\mu$ ov к.т. $\lambda$. 'Inter articulum et nomen äpa collocatum
 Ind. s.v.). mâג $\lambda_{o \nu}$ is occasionally used by Aristotle not only in the same clause with a comparative (as in Plato, Polit. ${ }_{2} 59$ C sub fin.), but also, it would seem, in close connexion with it (e.g. in Hist. An. 9. 1. 608 b 5, $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ фаעє $\omega \dot{\tau} \tau \rho a:$ see other instances given in Bon. Ind. 402 b 53 sqq .), and it may be so used here (cp. Top.

 But as Bonitz says of the passages in which $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ is used with a comparative, 'saepe dubites utrum $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda_{o \nu}$ "magis" an "potius" significet,' and $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu \eta$ ク may mean 'potius quam' in the passage before us.
20. kaтà Tòv aủtòv $\delta$ è k.т. $\lambda .$, 'and in accordance with this same contention, even if it should be better that certain individuals should rule [and not the law alone], it will be right to make these individuals guardians of the laws and ministers to the laws, [for otherwise the law will not rule].' Magistrates who are only guardians of the laws are contrasted with Kings by Plato in




 Athens swore $\sigma v \mu \phi \nu \lambda a ́ \xi \epsilon \iota \nu$ roùs עó $\mu o v s$ (Pollux, 8. 86).
22. ávaүкаîov үà $\rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. Magistrates are necessary, because there are things which the law cannot regulate (1287 b 19-25). With ॄ̈va тои̂тov (cp. c. 17. 1288 a 19) supply äp $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu$, and cp. Plato,

 éкєivò นóvapХov.
23. $\alpha \lambda \lambda d{ }^{\mu} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. See on this passage vol. i. p. 273 , note 2 , where the view which Bernays takes of it has been explained. His rendering is, '[hier wendet vielleicht Jemand ein : gegen die Lückenhaftigkeit des Gesetzes helfen Beamte nicht, denn] wo das Gesetz ausser Stande scheint, etwas Bestimmtes zu verordnen, wird auch wohl kein Mensch im Stande sein, sich ein festes Urtheil zu bilden.' I still prefer the explanation which has been given in vol. i. p. 273. I take $\grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \ldots \gamma \epsilon$ to introduce not an objection proceeding from an advocate of the claims of the One Best Man-objections are commonly introduced by ả入入á, as in c. 15.1286 b 24, 26 -but a still more cogent argument in favour of the claims of Law than those which have hitherto been urged. ('A $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{\eta} \nu \ldots \gamma \epsilon$ introduces a similar transition from a statement advanced with less emphasis to a statement advanced with more in 2. 9. 1271a $18-22$, 3. 13. 1284 b 30, and 3.16 .1287 a 41.) Aristotle has been reminded by what he has just said, ảvaүкniov $\gamma \dot{\alpha} p$ eivaí tıvas ápxás (22), that there are things which the law cannot regulate, so that as to them the law cannot rule, as he has said in 18 sqq. that it ought to do, and now he adds that with respect to these things the law is no worse off than a human being would be. They are as much beyond the cognizance of a human being as they are beyond definition by the law. But the law does all that can be done in relation to them, for it educates the magistrates to supply its own defect of particularity, and it also allows of its own amendment.

 (vol. i. p. 273, note r), that Aristotle here has before him the oath taken by the Athenian juror. See Demosth. in Lept. c. 118. A similar oath is prescribed to be taken by jurors in an inscription from Eresus in Lesbos (Hicks, Greek Historical Inscriptions, No. 125, p. 21 1). The expression kaтà $\gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu a \nu$ тàv סıкаเoтáтà occurs also in an inscription from Calymna and in the oath of the Delphian Amphictyons (Dareste, Inscriptions Juridiques Grecques, I. I70). Its meaning may be gathered from Demosth. in Eubulid. c. $6_{3}$,

 not only jurors (cp. 1287 b 15 sq.) but office-holders generally, as may be inferred from the words крiveıv каi $\delta$ เоккєiv. For éфíттךбь

 єن̉кorцias. Tà $\lambda o \iota \pi a ́, ~ ' w h a t e v e r ~ i t ~ c a n n o t ~ r e g u l a t e ~ i n ~ d e t a i l . ' ~ '$



 $\kappa а \lambda \omega ิ s ~ \epsilon \epsilon \xi є \iota \gamma a ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$. Contrast Plato's language in Polit. 294 B sq.
28. ờ $\mu$ èv oûv к.т.入. I take oûv here to contain an inference, as in I. I. $125^{2}$ a 7 (see note), and translate 'therefore.' Attention has been drawn in what precedes to the reasonableness of law. The contrast of $\theta$ єós and $\theta \eta p i o v$ and of both with à $\nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os is familiar to us from 1. 2. 1253 a 27 sqq. The rule of law had been represented by Plato (Laws $713 \mathrm{C}-714 \mathrm{~A}$ ) as an approach to the rule of the $\delta a i \mu o v \epsilon s$ of Cronus, vó $\mu$ os being explained as vov̂ $\delta \iota a \nu o \mu \dot{\eta}$ (cp. Laws 674 B). Reason is, in fact, often identified with God, e. g. in Eurip. Fragm. 1007,

cp. Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 1. $28 \mathrm{I}, \nu \hat{\varphi} \pi \epsilon i \theta o v$ : $\delta \mu o i a$ $\tau \hat{\eta}, \pi \epsilon i \theta o v \theta \in \hat{\varphi}$. Aristotle conceives a human being as an union of a god in the shape of reason (cp. Eth. Nic. 10. 7.1177 b 26 sqq.) with a brute, much as Plato in Rep. 588 C sqq. conceives the human soul as three shapes under the external aspect of a man, the shape of a many-headed animal, the shape of a lion, and the shape of a man, representing respectively desire, $\theta v \mu$ ós, and reason. That a brute is present in every human being was suggested by such phrases as those used by the Chorus of Women in the Lysistrata of Aristophanes ( 683 sq. Didot),
where a proverb is alluded to (Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 1. 318).
31. kaì ò $\theta u \mu$ òs к.т.ג. Aristotle probably remembers Hom. Il. 9. 553,


and Pindar, Olymp. 7. 27-31. The remark would gain in interest if it was suggested by the complicity of Dion in the murder of Heracleides at Syracuse (Plut. Dion, cc. 47, 53) or by Alexander's murder of Cleitus in B. C. 328 , but it would be rash to assume this.



32．סıótep äveu ỏpégecus voûs ò vónos éctiv，＇hence＇（i．e．because Law is God and Reason unmixed with anything else）＇Law is Reason without appetite，＇and Reason without appetite is better than Reason with appetite（c．15． 1286 a 17 sq ．）．Cp．De An． 3.
 oùk öp $\theta \dot{\eta}$ ．Anaxagoras had said that it is by virtue of being à $\mu \tau \gamma^{\prime}$ s and pure that voôs subdues everything（Fragm． 6 in Mullach， Fragm．Philos．Gr．1．249：Aristot．Phys．8．5． 256 b 24 sqq．： De An．3．4． 429 a 18 sqq．）．

33．тò $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \tau \neq \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ к．т．．入．This corrects the argument used in c． 15.1286 a II sqq．＂Oть к．т．入．gives，in explanation of тò $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \omega ิ \nu \pi a \rho \dot{o} \delta \epsilon \tau \gamma \mu a$ ，the point which the parallel of the arts is adduced to prove．

34．For кaì aipetútepoy cp．Eth．Nic．10．9．1179 a 6，of yà $\rho$
 $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$, Pol．2．4． 1262 a 30 ，and 5 （8）．7．1341 b 37 ．See critical note．

35．oi $\mu \grave{̀} \nu$ үàp к．т．t．，＇＇for［it is better to be treated by physicians rather than by written rule only because］physicians do not do anything contrary to right reason for the sake of friendship．＇ I follow Bernays in thus completing the reasoning．For mapà rò̀

 1125 b 33 sqq．
37．oi $\delta^{\prime} \hat{c}^{\prime} \nu$ taîs mo入ıtıкaîs ápxaîs к．т．ג．Cp．Plut．Aristid．c．4， where Plutarch says of Aristides，oủ $\mu$ óvov $\begin{aligned} & \text { ò } \\ & \pi \rho \rho \grave{s} \\ & \text { eivvotav kaì xápıv }\end{aligned}$



38． $\begin{gathered}\pi \\ \epsilon i \\ \text { к．．т．入．This passage may be rendered in two different }\end{gathered}$ ways．1．With Liddell and Scott（who compare Strabo，p．259，
 we may take $\delta$ ba $\phi \theta$ eipelv as in the infinitive after mıoteveívras roî ex expois，and translate＇since when［the case is otherwise and］ patients suspect physicians of being commissioned by their enemies to destroy them for the sake of gain．＇2．We may（with Bernays） take $\delta$ oab $\theta \epsilon i \rho \epsilon t \nu$ as in the infinitive after ímorтévort toùs iarpoús． I incline to prefer the latter rendering，especially as oòà кépoos comes in a little awkwardly，if we adopt the former．Aristotle has

 (oi iatpoi) «̇токтıvviaotv: indeed, he only repeats what Plato himself in effect says in Polit. 300 A. If it was not clear that he has this passage of Plato before him, we might be tempted to imagine that he alludes to a well-known incident in Alexander's career, the relation of which in Plutarch's Life of Alexander (c. 19) begins thus, $\begin{gathered} \\ \nu\end{gathered}$






 This happened in b. с. 333.

 c. 28.
 ' 'Iarpò̀ ciớy'єlv ruvi, to call in a physician for another, Xen. Mem. 2. 4. 3, Demosth. c. Everg. et Mnesib. c. 67 , but in Med. of the physician himself when ill' (Liddell and Scott, who refer to the passage before us). 'E $\phi$ ' éautoús, 'to take charge of themselves' (see note on 1273 b 19, ėmì ràs $\pi \dot{\partial} \hat{\lambda} \epsilon t s$ ). Not only do patients prefer a written scheme of treatment to treatment by physicians whom they regard as corrupted by their foes, but physicians themselves show distrust even of medical advice which is simply wanting in dispassionateness, for, when they are sick, they do not treat themselves, but call in other physicians. They do so because they feel that they are themselves at such a time under the influence of emotion, and that they need the guidance of a neutral dispassionate authority.
3. Sıà tò крі́velv $\pi \in \rho i ́ ~ t \in ~ o i k \epsilon i ́ \omega v ~ k a i ̀ ~ e ̂ v ~ \pi a ́ \theta e t ~ o ̂ v t e s . ~ C p . ~ T h u c . ~ 1 . ~ 1287 ~ b . ~$
 and see Mr. W. H. Forbes, Thucydides Book i. p. 15 I. For ${ }^{\text {ev }}$ $\pi a ́ \theta \epsilon \iota$ övтes cp. Eth. Nic. 7.8. 1150 a 27 sqq . and 7.5 . 1147 b 9 sqq. Aristotle seems to think that not only sick physicians, but also gymnastic trainers, when engaged in gymnastic exercises, would be $\hat{\epsilon} v \pi \dot{\theta} \theta \epsilon \epsilon$.

§nrovoct. In 1287b 23 we have to supply in a similar way 'the advocates of the supremacy of law.' 'And so it is clear that [those who seek for written law] in seeking for that which is just seek for that which is neutral, for the law is that which is neutral.' This is made clear by the practice of physicians to which reference has just been made. So that the parallel of the arts, far from telling against the use of written law in the State, as some claimed that it does, in reality furnishes an argument in favour of its use. That the way to the just lies through the neutral, we see from Eth. Nic. 5. 7. I1 32 a 19 (already compared by Eaton), òtò кaì ötav ả $\mu \phi \iota \sigma \beta \eta$ -



 in place of $\dot{\delta}$ yà рó $\mu$ os without MS. authority and not, I think, rightly.
5. ёть кupıต́tєpoı к.т. 入. Aristotle has just been asserting the value of written law (cp. 1287 a 34 , катà $\gamma \rho \dot{a ́ \mu \mu a \tau a, ~ a n d ~} 40, \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ ह́к $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu$ $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu i ́ \tau \omega \nu \quad \theta \in \rho a \pi \epsilon \epsilon i a \nu)$, and now he says that the case is even stronger in favour of unwritten law. For the distinction between oi katà
 resting on (unwritten) customs,' cp. Diog. Laert. 3. 86 (a passage





 (as $\begin{gathered}\text { č } \\ \eta\end{gathered}$ are in Plato, Polit. 295 A, 299 A, and Laws 84 I B), cp. 8 (6). 5. 1319 b 40 sq. On äүpaфot vóнot see Cope, Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric, pp. ${ }^{239-244}$, where he concludes (p. 244) that customs are 'what we are to understand principally by the vómot aypaoo in the Politics,' so that the term is used in the Politics in a wider sense than it is when it refers, as it sometimes does (see Cope), to 'the great fundamental conceptions and duties of morality,' such as 'the worship of God, duty to parents, gratitude, the requital of benefits,' and the like. For the fact that more important matters are dealt with by unwritten than by written laws,





 є $\theta \in \sigma \tau \nu$ in 1292 b 16 .
 well,] for the one man to keep an eye on many things.' Eurip. Phoeniss. 692 Bothe ( 745 Dindorf), cís àvìp oú đávt' ópâ, had passed into a proverb (Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 2.378). Cp.




 monian ephors at their origin designed to be the 'eyes' of the Kings? The word '̈ $\phi$ opoo is used in the sense of 'spies' by Megasthenes ap. Strab. p. 707 (see note on 1313b 12).
10. тои̂тo, i. e. тò $\pi \lambda \epsilon i o v a s ~ \epsilon i v a u ~ a ̈ p \chi o v t a s . ~$
11. $\pi \rho o ́ т \epsilon \rho$ ро, in C. I5. 1286 b 3 sqq.
 by $\delta \epsilon \epsilon$. For the use of $\delta \epsilon$ in the apodosis after a conditional sentence introduced by $\epsilon \boldsymbol{i}$ or $\notin a ́ v$, , see above on 1278 a $3^{2}$.




and 13.235 sqq. Cp. Trag. Gr. Fragm. Adespota 450,






 คŋๆ
14. kai ŋ̀ єủxท̀ к.т.ג. Hom. Il. 2. 372, where Agamemnon is speaking of Nestor (Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 651 ).
 II, toùtov tòv tpónov, in which words the suggestion is made that the powers which it is proposed to entrust to the One Man should rather be given to a plurality of magistrates. " $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \delta \delta \delta \iota \kappa a \sigma \tau \eta s$, for
it was well known from the terms of the dicast's oath (see above on $1287 \mathrm{a}^{25}$ ) that he had to regulate matters as to which the law was silent. Aristotle has already implied in 1287 a 25 sqq. that the magistrates have to do so too in relation to some matters. Cp . 6 (4). 4. 1292 a $3^{2}$ sqq.

 Bon. Ind. 187 b 1 sqq., where Eth. Eud. 1. 5. 1216 a 11 , סıamo-
 the passage before us.
23. oủ toívuv к. т.ג., ' nay, [the advocates of the supremacy of law] do not make this counter-assertion that' etc. Ov̇ toivev is used in self-correction: see above on 1267 a 5 and compare in addition to the passages there referred to Plato, Rep. 603 B, and Strato, Fragłh. Фovviiôns, 3 (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 546),
 тоюои́т $\omega \nu$.
26. ăтотóv $\tau^{\text {’ }}$ औैws к.т. $\lambda$. For the thought compare Xen. Cyrop. 8. 2. 10-12, a passage which seems to be present to Aristotle's memory here. "I $\delta o \iota$ evidently suits ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu a \sigma \iota$ only, not àkoais or what follows, but Aristotle 'often expects us to supply a word from a previous clause which is not altogether suitable': see above on 1257 a 2 I . For ákoais in the sense of 'organs of hearing' see Bon. Ind. s.v.
27. Sooir is apparently the reading of all extant MSS. (one cannot tell from 'duobus' what reading Vet. Int. found in his text), but the Index Aristotelicus gives no other instance of its occurrence in Aristotle's writings as the dative of $\delta i^{n}-\mathrm{it}$ is common enough in them as the genitive, but $\delta v o i$ or $\delta \dot{v} o$ are the forms of the dative mostly used by Aristotle-and here it strikes us as all the more strange because it is followed by סvoiv and סvai. According to Meisterhans, Grammatik der att. Inschriften, p. 124 (ed. 2), סvoív is used as the genitive and dative in Attic Inscriptions down to в. с. 329 , $\delta v \in i ̂ \nu ~ f r o m ~ в . c . ~ 329 ~ t o ~ в . с . ~ 229, ~ a n d ~ \delta i o ~ a s ~ t h e ~ g e n i t i v e, ~$ $\delta v \sigma i$ as the dative, in Roman times. Thus, if the MSS. are to be trusted, Aristotle often departs in this matter from the usage of the Attic Inscriptions of his time.
29. émei kaì vôv к.т. $\lambda$. Ho入入oús is emphatic (see note on 1275 a


 $\dot{\alpha} к о \dot{\sigma} \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon$ к.т. $\lambda$., where Xenophon probably intends to correct Hdt. I.


 messengers mentioned by Herodotus would be included among the 'King's feet' referred to by Aristotle here. The 'many ears and eyes' of a King became proverbial: cp. Lucian, Adv. Indoct.
 fact that Cyrus had fallen in the battle of Cunaxa was discovered and reported to Artaxerxes by an 'eye of the King;' Artasuras
 Hiero I of Syracuse (7 (5). II. I3 13 b i3 sqq.: cp. Plut. De Curiositate, c. 16) and the 'younger members' of the Nocturnal Council of Plato's Laws ( 964 E : see vol. i. p. 448 sq.) were probably suggested by this Persian institution. According to Megasthenes (ap. Strab. p. 707) a similar institution existed in India: see his account of the $\epsilon$ єфорои.
30. тoùs үàp tท̂ àpxท̂n kaì aútoû фí̉ous motoûvtal ouvápXous. Aristotle probably remembers the words of Achilles to his friend Phoenix in Il. 9. 6I6,

Cp. also Plut. De Fraterno Amore, c. 18 sub fin., kaì tò $\Delta a \rho$ eíov
 коı $\omega \nu \epsilon i \nu ~ \pi \rho а ү \mu a ́ t \omega \nu ~ к a i ̀ ~ \delta \nu \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \omega s, ~ a n d ~ T h u c . ~ 2 . ~ 97 . ~ 3, ~ w h e r e ~ w e ~$
 of the King of the Odrysae in his rule). Monarchs expect of those whom they make partners in rule not only friendliness to their rule but also friendliness to themselves. The two things are not the same. Alexander, we remember, called Craterus $\phi$ i $\lambda 0-$ ßagı $\lambda \in u ́ s$ and Hephaestion фı $\lambda a \lambda$ égavópos (Plut. Alex. c. 47 : Diod. 17. 114): cp. Plut. Brut. c. 8, $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma \epsilon \tau a \iota ~ \delta e ̀ ~ B \rho o v ̂ \tau o s ~ \mu \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ á $\rho \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$
 course referred to. Tî̀ $\dot{\alpha} \rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ фíतoc should probably be read (with Casaubon and Richards : see critical note) in place of $\tau \hat{\eta} \hat{a} \rho x \hat{\eta} \phi i \lambda o \iota$, though this expression is used in an unfavourable sense in Lucian,


 wrongly au̇rov̂) Sus. would read av́rois, which is found in the version of the passage given by the Aldine edition of the Scholia on Aristophanes (Acharn. 92: Duebner excludes this quotation from the Politics from his text of the Scholia-see Dindorf's Preface, pp. iv-v Duebner, as to the Aldine edition), but not, I think, rightly: see above on 1286 a 12. The title 'friend of the King' probably came originally from Egypt, where we trace it as early as the Twelfth Dynasty (see Maspero, Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient, p. 104, ed. r), and even the Sixth (Erman, Life in Ancient Egypt, Eng. Trans., p. 72). The Macedonian Kings made those whom they raised to the dignity of 'friends' so far partners in rule that they consulted them on the most important matters and employed them on the most important commissions (see Spitta, De Amicorum, qui vocantur, in Macedonum Regno Condicione, p. 38, who refers among other passages to Diod. 17. 54, and Arrian, Anab. 1. 25.4). חoьov̀vaı here takes the place of moぃov̂бıv, 29, just as in c. 5. 1278 a

 necessity be, for] if they are not friends,' etc.


34. oītal $\delta \in i ̂ \nu$ äpXєtv, sc. ó ßaбı入єús.
 24 , where see note.
C. 17. 36. Ėगi $\mu \in \in v ~ \tau \iota v \omega v$, 'in the case of some persons.' I follow Bernays, from whom Sus. differs (Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. 443 : Qu. Crit. p. 396 sqq.), in taking $\tau \iota \nu \omega \nu$ to be masculine: cp. c. 14. 1284 b 40 ,

 marked out by nature to be ruled by a master, and another to be ruled by a King, and another marked out for free government, and it is expedient and just that each should be thus ruled.' For кai

 $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$, I. 6. 1255 b 6 sqq., and 4 (7).9. 1329 a 16 sq. I prefer the
 of Sepulveda, 'et horum imperiorum cuiusque aliud est ius et alia commoditas,' though Bernays translates the passage in a somewha:
similar way. Richards would add $\tau$ oùro after Sikaıov, 39. For ë́vt үrip тє фर́бєt $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ тобтóv, cp. 1. 6. 1255 b 6 sqq. and 4 (7). 2. 1324 b 36 sqq . Шодเтเкóv in $3^{8}$, каї ã̀ $\lambda \lambda о \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa o ́ \nu$, appears to be used in reference to the kind of free government which obtains in a Polity, for Aristotle is evidently speaking of normal constitutions only, and he can hardly refer in $\pi$ o入ıтıкón to Aristocracy. Of course, if we regard 1288 a $6-15$ as authentic and as placed where it stands by Aristotle, we have an additional reason for taking $\pi<\lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa o ́ \nu$ to refer to the Polity, for it clearly refers to the Polity in $\mathbf{1 2} 88$ a $7, \mathbf{1} 2$.
40. oúठє̀ Tต̂v ẳ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ mo $\lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \iota \omega ิ v$, 'nor any of the other constitutions.' For the genitive, cp. 5 (8). 4.1338 b 3 , and Diod. 5.21 .2 ,


 p. 274-5. In 1288 a I we have a $\mu$ fév solitarium (see above on 1262 a 6).

 к.т. $\lambda$.

 see note on 1277 a 3 r.
 of Plato to Dionysius the Elder recorded in Diog. Laert. 3. 18,

 also Xen. Cyrop. 8. 1. 37.
6. $\pi \rho o ́ т \epsilon \rho о v$, in c. 13.1284 a 3 sqq.
$\pi \rho \hat{\omega}$ tov $\delta$ è . . . 15. ápXós. Susemihl brackets this paragraph as an interpolation, and it looks at any rate like a subsequently added passage. It may well be from the pen of Aristotle-its contents do not seem to be seriously at variance with his teaching elsewhere (see vol. i. Appendix D)—but it is doubtful whether it was placed where it stands by his hand or by that of another. A similar doubt arises as to other passages in the Politics (see for instance vol. i. p. 569 and p. 519, note). The position of this paragraph in relation to its context is certainly remarkable. Aristotle is discussing Kingship, and in particular is about to describe what degree of superiority over those he rules an Absolute King should possess: why should he pause at this point to explain
who are fit subjects for Kingship, Aristocracy, and Polity, when he is concerned for the moment only with Kingship? And why is it necessary to enter into this question as to Aristocracy and Polity first ( $\pi \rho \hat{\omega}$ тov, 1288 a 6 ), before stating what degree of superiority over those he rules an Absolute King should possess? Then again, though the recapitulation in 1288 a 30 sqq. makes it clear that in what has preceded it has been explained for whom Kingship is an expedient institution, this may refer only to what has been said in 1288 a $\mathbf{1}_{5-19}$. On the other hand, it may be urged in defence of the paragraph that it is after a long argument in favour of Aristocracy (in the sense of the rule of a plurality of good men) that Aristotle interposes his closing remark in 1287 b 36 sq., 'but perhaps these things are so in the case of certain persons and not in the case of others,' and that therefore he may naturally wish to explain before he goes further who are the persons in whose case the arguments in favour of Aristocracy hold good, no less than who are the persons in whose case the arguments in favour of Kingship hold good. Nor is it altogether surprising that he should add a similar explanation as to Polity, for he has implied in 1287 b 37 sqq. that there are those who are marked out by nature for each of the normal constitutions. Still it must be admitted that the paragraph has an intrusive look where it stands.
8. тò rotoôtov here refers not to anything preceding; but to what follows. See for other instances of the same thing note on 1337 b 6 . As to $\phi$ éfetw, see vol. i. p. 290, note 1 . The case is omitted in which Kingship falls to a single individual, not a $\gamma^{\prime}$ vos.

 à $\rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ in 12 and $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \kappa$ óv in $\mathbf{1}_{3}$. The King is to be capable
 The word $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu$ ovía belongs especially to Kingship: cp. Rhet. ad




 ì $\gamma \epsilon \mu$ орía.
ápıatokpatıkòv $\delta$ è . . . 15. tàs ápxás. See vol. i. Appendix D.
 oligarchies (Eth. Nic. 8. 12. 1161 a 2 sq.).


$\pi \circ \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ v \delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os к.т. $\lambda$. The law in a polity gives office to the well-to-do, just as in an aristocracy office falls to the $\gamma^{\nu} \omega_{\rho \iota \mu о \iota ~(7 ~(5) . ~}^{7}$. 8. I309 a 2). Does $\kappa a \tau^{\prime}$ ákian imply that office will be elective in a polity? If so, cp. 6 (4). 9.1294 b 10 sqq . and contrast 6 (4). 14. 1298 b $8-11$ and 6 (4). 15. 1300 a 34 sqq., passages which, however defective the text of the latter may be, seem to show that magistrates might be appointed by lot in a polity (see vol. i. pp. 509, 573).
15. As to $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{a}{ }{ }^{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ see critical note.
18. кaì кúpıov $\pi a ́ v t \omega v$ is added because not all Kings are кúpıo тáขтต (c. 14. 1285 a 4).
19. $\pi$ оо́тєрог, in c. 13. 1284 b 25 sqq.
 катà тò aủtò סíkaıov.
22. आávтท $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к.т. $\lambda_{\text {., ' 'for they entirely claim on the basis of }}$ superiority, though not the same superiority.' Aristotle's account in Eth. Nic. 5. 6. II 3 I a 25 sqq. of the 'superiority' on which the partisans of democracy base their claims does not agree with the account given in Pol. 8 (6). 2. 1317 b 3 sqq., for in the former passage (cp. Pol. 7 (5). I. 1301 b 28 sqq.) they are said to base their claims on $\mathfrak{a} \xi^{\prime} \dot{a}$ - the $\mathfrak{a} \xi i a$, in fact, which ${ }^{\dot{\epsilon}} \lambda \epsilon \cup \theta \in \rho i a$ confers-and in the latter not on ảkia but on number. Still, whichever of the two passages we follow, they base their claims on a 'superiority.'
 course is becoming or in accordance with nature: cp.c. 13. 1284 b 28 sqq.
28. тоûto, i. . to constitute the whole of which the rest are parts.
31. $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$, ' under what conditions' (so Bern.). Cp. c. 3. 1276 a


32. émei $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. At this point a transition is made from the C. 18. question what are the different forms of Kingship and for whom Kingship is advantageous to the question how a Kingship or an Aristocracy (for the two forms turn out in 34 sqq. to be nearly related, cp .6 (4). 2.1289 a 3 r sqq. and 7 (5). 10 . 13 Iob 2 sq ., 3 I sq.) is to be brought into being. For a similar transition cp. 6 (4).

8． $1294 \mathrm{a}_{25} \mathrm{sqq}$ ．The reasoning of the paragraph which com－ mences at $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ is－the best State is an aristocratical or Kingly State，but the virtue of a citizen of the best State is the same as the virtue of a good man；hence the virtue of a citizen of an aristocratical State or of a man of Kingly mould is identical with the virtue of a good man；hence to institute an aristocratical or Kingly State it is necessary to have recourse to the education and customs which produce good men．This preface prepares us to find in the Fourth and Fifth（old Seventh and Eighth）Books what we do find there－inquiries directed to the discovery of the educa－ tion and customs which produce good men．As to the transition from the Third to the Fourth Book see vol．i．p． 292 sqq．

34．The use of the word oikovouou $\mu$ év $\eta$ indicates the completeness of the control exercised：cp．c．14．1285 b 3 r sqq．


 ढ̈ $\quad$ таи к．т．入．
 by Plato in his Politicus that the essence of the Bactickós and the то入兀tuкós is to possess a certain science．Just as he had said in
 rotóodé $\epsilon i v a t$ ，so he now implies the same thing as to the $\beta$ aatickós and the $\pi$ òrtrikós．The education which is to produce them is not the communication of a science；it is the communication of

 however，allows in 4 （7）． 3 ． 1325 b 10 sqq．（cp．3．13． 1284 a 5 sqq． and $7(5)$ ． 9 ． 1309 a 33 sqq．）that the ruler should possess not only virtue but also political aptitude．In 5 （8）．6．I341 a 8 certain
 apparently in Aristotle＇s scheme of education，though their exact nature is left obscure，and these толıткаà àбкíनets may perhaps be one means by which he would seek to develope this political aptitude， but he probably thought that the art of ruling was mainly acquired in the course of being ruled（3．4．1277 b 8 sqq．）．

 tov̀s $\beta$ appápovs．In 4 （7）．13．1332 b 10，on the other hand，it is implied that $\pi a \Delta \delta$ eia comprises an element of habituation．
2. In place of $\pi$ одıтıкóy we expect ajpıтокрatıкóv, but the rulers in the best State have already been spoken of as moл七тькоi in c. 5.1278 b 3 .
 two questions are raised as to the Polity in 6 (4). 9. 1294 a 30 sqq.

## BOOK IV (VII).

14. Compare the very similar sentence in De An. 2. 4.4 I 5 a 14, C. 1.
 aủtติข $\tau i \in \epsilon \in \tau \iota \nu$. For $\mu^{\epsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ with the aor. infin. Bonitz (Ind. s.v.)

 the use of $\mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda^{\prime} \lambda_{\epsilon l \nu}$ with the aor. infin., but that it is so used by Attic writers is undoubted: see Goodwin, Moods and Tenses, § 74. Schanz remarks in his Prolegomena to Plato's Symposium, § 5, ' aoristi infinitivi cum $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$ a Platone copulati exempla apud Platonem exstant, quae haud facile quispiam in dubitationem vocare possit.' He refers among other passages to Protag. 3 I2 B, $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon t s \pi a \rho a \sigma \chi \in i \nu$, and Gorg. 512 E , ồ $\mu \epsilon ́ \lambda \lambda o \iota \chi \rho o ́ \nu o \nu \beta \iota \omega ิ \nu a l$, and $5^{2} 5 \mathrm{~A}$. It is natural that Aristotle should find the clue to the best constitution in the inquiry what is the most desirable life, for we read in 6 (4). II. I295 a 40 that 'the constitution is the mode of life chosen by the State.' See vol. i. p. 209 sqq. An instructive commentary on the first chapter will be found in the second of Vahlen's Aristotelische Aufsätze, Über ein Capitel aus Aristoteles' Politik, from which I shall frequently have occasion to make quotations.
15. For $\pi \rho \omega ิ \tau o \nu$ in the sense of $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$ Vahlen (Aristot. Aufs. 2. 5, note) compares 3. 4. 1276 b 19.
16. äрıтта $\gamma$ à $\rho \pi \rho \dot{\text { átтєLレ к.т. } \lambda \text {., 'for [the best constitution and the }}$ most desirable life go together, inasmuch as] it is fitting that those who live under the best constitution their circumstances enable them to attain should fare best, unless something contrary to expectation happens.' It has already been pointed out (vol. i. p. 294, note 2) that the reasoning latent in the Greek cannot be fully expressed in English. For the thought cp. Plato, Laws



qualification 'their circumstances enable them to attain' ( $\epsilon 火 火 \tau \omega$ iாaрХо́vт $\omega \nu$ aủrois), for those who fare best must be those who live under the absolutely best constitution, which is contrasted in 6 (4). I. 1288 b 25 sq., 32 with the best attainable under given circum-

17. $\pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ ©́s єimeiv, 'all individuals, so to say,' for $\pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ corresponds to éкá $\sigma \tau \varphi$, cp. 1323 b 2 r. Aristotle first discusses the question what is the most desirable life for the individual ( 1323 a $21-b 29$ ), and then the same question as to the State.





where, as Gomperz remarks (Die Bruchstücke der griech. Tragiker, p. 33), $\chi \omega \rho i s$ ( $=$ ioia, 'privatim,' 'seorsum') serves to distinguish the individual lot of the speaker from the general lot of women.
$\nu \circ \mu i \boldsymbol{\sigma} \alpha \nu \tau a s$ oûv . . . 23. aúrois, 'holding then that many of the things said in the non-scientific inquiries also respecting the best life are adequately said, we must now too make use of them.' On the question what 'non-scientific inquiries' are here referred to, something has been said in vol. i. p. 299, note I. The expression $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \dot{\xi} \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \iota к о \grave{\imath} \lambda o ́ \gamma o \iota$, when used by Aristotle, does not necessarily refer to non-scientific inquiries of his own, still less to writings of his own, but it probably refers to writings of his own in the passage before us, for, besides that, as Zeller remarks (Gr. Ph. 2. 2. II9. 2 : Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. II5, note 4), the contents of the passage are quite Aristotelian in spirit, it seems to be implied in the words кai $\nu \hat{v} v$, ' now too,' that Aristotle has himself said these things before (cp. Meteor. 1. 3. 339 b 3 ,
 ס̀̀ rò̀ aủrò̀ $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu$ кaì $\nu u ̂ \nu$, and 341 a 12 sqq.). Whether, as Bernays held (Dialoge des Aristoteles, p. 69 sqq.), a Dialogue of Aristotle is here 'used,' is uncertain, for the non-scientific writings of Aristotle were not all of them Dialogues (Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 123: Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 119 sq.). What is the exact meaning of גpךотє́ov? The

 av̇oîs, where $\chi$ рпотє́o seems to introduce merely a statement of results, but it does not follow that it always means no more than
this．Bernays thought that we have in $\mathrm{r}_{32}$ a 24 sqq．a verbatim extract from the non－scientific composition made use of．Against this Vahlen argues in the second of his Aristotelische Aufsätze． Zeller holds（Gr．Ph．2．2．119．2 ：Eng．Trans．，vol．i．p． 1 I5， note 4）that the contents of the non－scientific composition are reproduced，not indeed verbatim，but pretty closely（＇ziemlich eng anzuschliessen scheint＇），and we are certainly conscious（with Bernays）of a freer flow of periods in the first chapter than we often meet with in Aristotle＇s writings，though Vahlen has shown that many of the expressions used occur elsewhere in them． Bernays takes the use of the＇̇छ由тєpıкoì 入óyou to extend to the end of the first chapter，and it would seem from the words $\pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{i}{i} \tau \hat{\eta} \mathrm{c}$ cipiorvs广 $\omega \hat{\mathrm{j}}$ s in 23 that all that is said on this subject is based on them，so that they will have been used at any rate down to $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu, \mathrm{I}_{2} 23 \mathrm{~b}$ 36．If we ask why Aristotle has recourse on this subject to the
 the Nicomachean Ethics－Zeller finds teaching to the same effect in Eth．Nic．r． 6 sqq．， 10.6 sqq．－the answer probably is that he prefers，when he can，to refer to the more popularly written and more generally accessible class of compositions．Zeller（Hermes， r5． 553 sqq．：see vol．ii．p．x，note r）thinks that the passage 1323 a 2 I sqq．，in addition to Eth．Nic．I．8． 1098 b 9 sqq．，was before the writer of Eth．Eud．2．1． 1218 b 32，đávra ò̀ $\tau a ̉ \gamma a \nexists a ̀ ~ \hat{\eta}$



 c． 7 ． 1328 a 3 and 5 （8）．7．1341 b 27 ，and see above on 127 I b 4. As to the case of vopícuvras see note on 1275 a 16 ．
 goods］at any rate no one would contend，＇etc．Táp introduces a justification of the use of the $\epsilon \xi \omega \tau \epsilon \rho ı$ oì $\lambda$ óyou on the ground of



 tion that the happy need not possess all three kinds of goods run counter to the division of goods into these three kinds？Appar－ ently in this way．The division implies that all the three kinds of goods are goods，and it is taken for granted that those who are to
be happy should possess all goods (4 (7). 15. 1334a 28 sqq.). There were other divisions of goods-among them a division into є̇тaıvєєવ́, тípa, and $\delta v \nu a ́ \mu \epsilon \iota s$ (Eth. Nic. I. 12). As to the division into external goods, goods of the body, and goods of the soul, see vol. i. p. 299, note r. That wealth should be accompanied by virtue had often been said by the poets (Sappho, Fragm. 81 : Pindar, Olymp. 2. 53 sqq. and Pyth. 5. 1 sqq. : Eurip. Fragm. 163: compare Lysander's remark to the younger Cyrus in Cic. De Senect. 17. 59, recte vero te, Cyre, beatum ferunt, quoniam virtuti tuae fortuna coniuncta est), and Simonides (Fragm. 70) had said that health should accompany wisdom. Cp. also Rhet. I. 5. 1360 b 14 sqq. and Eth. Nic. 7. 14. II53 b if sqq. When Aristotle sought to show in the inquiry which commences here that the chief ingredient in évoarpovia is virtue, his work was half done for him by the ordinary use of the Greek language. To the Greeks
 ó $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ калà $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \omega \nu$, and $\tau \grave{a}$ калà $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ implied virtue. Our word 'happiness' has no such link with virtue.
18. оú $\delta \epsilon i \frac{1}{s} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т.入. The word $\mu$ aкáptos is used throughout the first chapter as interchangeable with $\epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a i \mu \omega \nu$, but it is a slightly stronger word, as we see from Eth. Nic. I. II. IIOI a 6-8. Aristotle offers no proof that the happy should possess external goods and the goods of the body, no doubt because he considers it unnecessary to do so; the only question likely to be raised is whether they need possess the goods of the soul. Compare Plato, Phileb. 2 I, which is evidently present to his memory. For фaí $\mu$ акápıò without єivaı cp. 2. 3. 126I b 22.



 of harmless flies. As to cowardice of this kind see Eth. Nic. 7. 6. II49 a 4 sqq.
 To act thus is to be like a wild beast: cp. Plato, Laws 83i D,

 $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \circ \nu \eta \nu$, which is imitated in Epist. 7. 335 A sq. For $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \sigma \eta$
 $\epsilon ่ \pi(\theta \nu \mu \omega \nu$, and I. 7. 3, and Xen. Oecon. 14. 9.
19. ópoíms Sè k.t.入. Cp. Eth. Nic. 10. 2. 1174 a 1, oủófis $\tau^{\prime}$ âv

 $\mu \in ́ v o \nu$ Vahlen compares Phylarch. ap. Athen. Deipn. 536 e, oũт

 oัруауóv $\tau \iota$, and see Bon. Ind. 763 a 16 sqq., where Meteor. 3. 3 .
 ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ä $\sigma \tau \rho \omega \nu$, is referred to.
20. ả $\lambda \lambda \alpha \grave{\alpha}$ таûta $\mu \grave{\nu} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. ., 'but these things almost all men would admit when said; they differ, however, in respect of the quantity they desire of each good and in respect of their relative superiority.' As to $\lambda_{\epsilon \gamma \delta}{ }^{\mu} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon \nu a}$ Vahlen remarks that it is to be taken in close connexion with $\sigma v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon a \nu$, and compares among other passages Eth. Nic. 6. 1. 1138 b 322, $\delta \iota \grave{̀} \delta \epsilon i ̂$ кaì $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ тàs $\tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \eta ̂ s$





 perhaps not a quite conclusive parallel. Closer ones may be found in Plato: see Ast, Lex. Platon. s.v., who refers in illustration of the use of $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ in the sense of 'fere' to Protag. $346 \mathrm{~A}, \ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ ả $\sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o u s$, among other passages. For raîs intepoxaîs cp. $13^{2} 3 \mathrm{~b} 14$, катà т $\grave{\nu} \nu \dot{i} \pi \epsilon \rho \circ \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$. A different interpretation of $\tau a i ̂ s ~ i \pi \epsilon \rho \circ \chi a i ̂ s$ from that given above is, however, possible ; it might mean 'in respect of the excess they desire of this or that good' (cp. $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \beta o \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$, 38 , and $13^{2} 3$ b 8), but 'superiority,' not 'excess,' is probably the meaning. ' $Y \pi \epsilon \rho o \chi a i s$ appears to be in the plural because three different sorts of goods are measured against each other, so that whichever sort is preferred will conceivably possess one degree of superiority over the second and another over the third.
 ajerins by the whole length of the sentence for the sake of emphasis: see above on 128 r a 14 . Aristotle here remembers






21. For $\pi \lambda о$ úтои каї хр $\eta \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu$ Vahlen compares 1. 9. 1257 b 7 ,
 1. 13. 1259 b 20 as $\dot{\eta} \tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ảpєт $\eta$. Cp. also c. 5. 1326 b 33,

 compares the use of $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i{ }^{i s} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \omega \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ in De An. 1. 3.406 b 22 ,
 $\epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho o \hat{\mu} \mu \in$, and Pol. 4 (7). 3.1325 a 16 sqq. As to $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon i s$ see above on 1270 a 9.
 1323 b 6 (see note on 1284 b 4). חєрì тои́т $\omega \nu$, i. e. whether it is right to be content with a small amount of virtue and to seek an unlimited amount of external goods. In place of Sıàa $\beta$ áveıv Lambinus followed by Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ reads $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ (Sus. and Bonitz, Ind. s.v., also bracket the $\delta t a ́$ ), and it is true that in 2. 3.1262 a 17 we have ảvaүкaîo $\lambda a \mu ß a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ a ̉ \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta} \lambda \omega \nu \tau a ̀ s ~ \pi i \sigma \tau \epsilon \iota s$, and that no parallel has hitherto been adduced for the expression $\delta \iota a \lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu \pi i \sigma \tau \iota \nu$, but it is not perhaps absolutely certain that $\delta \iota a \lambda a \mu \beta a \dot{v e \iota \nu}$ is wrong. Many verbs compounded with סıá are occasionally used in a sense but little removed from that of the simple verb, e.g. Stavayкá $\zeta \epsilon \iota$, $\delta \iota a \pi о \rho \epsilon i ้ \nu, \delta \iota a \lambda a \nu \theta a \dot{\nu} \epsilon \iota \nu, \delta \iota a \phi u \lambda a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$, etc.
22. ธ́ $\rho \omega ิ \nu \tau a s$ öt к. к. $\lambda$. So that those who possess the virtues have the means of acquiring external goods in addition, whereas those who possess external goods have not necessarily the means of acquiring the virtues, whence it follows that the virtues are to be sought in preference to external goods. A little later, however, Aristotle says that external goods are the gift of fortune ( $\mathrm{I}_{3}{ }_{2} 3 \mathrm{~b}$ 27 sq.). He continues here to make use of the Apology of Plato,
















 Mor． 58 （Mullach，Fragm．Philos．Gr．I．344），סóǵa kaì $\pi \lambda o u ̂ \tau o s ~ a ̈ v \epsilon v ~$

 to in Bon．Ind．s．v．$\chi$ aipєıv）．Protarchus in Plato，Phileb． 21 A sqq． finds the Good to be tò $\chi$ aipeıv or pleasure．The word $\mu$ ккápıs was supposed to be derived from $\chi$ aipet（Eth．Nic．7．12．1152 b 6 sq．，quoted by Vahlen）．Tyrants were thought to be єvóaifoves каi $\mu$ ака́pto if they were seen to be in the daily enjoyment of bodily pleasures（ 7 （5）．II．I3 I 4 b 28 sqq．）．

 Evjòaurovia is said to be a combination of tò кaдóv and pleasure in 5 （8）． 5.1339 b 19 ：see vol．i．p．296，note 1.
o̊т七 $\mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda \frac{\nu}{\text { úmápXєь к．т．} \lambda \text { ．Compare the remark of Solon quoted }}$




 ỏ̀i＇ya $\nu o \hat{\nu}$ ढ̈́ $^{\prime} \omega \nu$ ；（cp．Laws 660 E ）．Compare also the remark of Bias to Croesus，made in support of Solon（Diod．9．27．3），$\tau \grave{a} \gamma \grave{a} \rho$

 evidaípovas，and two lines variously ascribed to Antiphanes（Inc． Fab．Fragm． 63 ：Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr．3．I54），Alexis（Inc．Fab． Fragm．4I：Meineke，3． 5 II），and Menander（Inc．Fab．Fragm． ${ }^{1} 75$ ：Meineke，4．273），


 Vahlen（Aristot．Aufs．2．16，note 1）compares Eth．Nic．1． 9. 1098 b 26，тク̀̀ є̇kтòs єv̉eтクpiav．Compare also Plato，Rep． 443 C ，




 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon ้ \xi े \omega ~ \sigma \omega \tau \eta \rho i a \nu$.

 Pace，§ $90, \pi \lambda \epsilon i \omega \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ iкаи⿳亠人$\nu$.

тоútoıs，i．е．тoîs $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ тò $\grave{\eta} \theta$ os кaì $\grave{\eta} \nu$ סıávotav ảya $\theta$ oîs，or（as in IO） тоîs $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \psi v \chi \eta ̀ \nu ~ a ̉ \gamma a \theta o i ́ s . ~$

6．oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu \grave{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \kappa$ к．, ． ．Aristotle proves that it is not well to be content with a small amount of virtue and to seek an unlimited amount of external goods by showing（ I ）that the goods of the soul are not，like external goods and öppava generally，harmful or useless when in excess，but on the contrary increase in utility with every increase in their amount；（2）that the best state of the soul is as much more precious（ $\tau \mu \mu \boldsymbol{\omega} \tau \epsilon \rho \rho \nu)$ than the best state of property and of the body as the soul is more precious than property and the body ；（3）that external and bodily goods are desirable for the sake of the soul，not the soul for the sake of external and bodily goods． On all these three grounds it is clear that the goods of the soul are to be sought to a far greater extent than the goods of the body and external goods．
 instruments have a limit，we see from I．8．1256b 35 sqq．and 4 （7）． $4 \cdot 1326$ a 35 sqq．
 merely external goods but bodily goods also，vol．i．p．299，note 2 ， and $\epsilon \dot{u} \tau u x^{i a}$ as a whole，Eth．Nic．7．14． 1153 b 21 sqq．）＇belongs to

 the sake of other goods（Eth．Nic．1．4． 1096 b 13 sqq．：i． 3.
 6 （4）．II．1295 b 3 sqq．and De Part．An．2．5． 65 I a 36 sqq．

9．avaүкаiov．＇In the first chapter of the Fourth Book of the Politics，which Bernays is probably right in believing to be taken over（herübergenommen）from an ethical dialogue，àváykn and àvaүкaiop are interchanged in such a way that the latter stands where the use of $\dot{\alpha} v i \not \gamma k \eta$ owing to its being followed by a vowel would have produced an hiatus＇（Kaibel，Stil und Text der חò兀тeía
＇AӨnvaioy des Aristoteles，p．ro）．Kaibel has apparently overlooked the fact that the same rule is followed throughout the Politics：see for instance 3．II． $1282 \mathrm{~b} \quad 8-13$ and 6 （4）．2． 1289 a 39－b I． I have noticed only one passage in the Politics in which àvá $\gamma \kappa \eta$
 ả $\mu \phi o \tau_{\epsilon ́ p o v s ~}^{\epsilon} \phi \theta \dot{a} p \theta a \iota ~ \hat{\eta}$ ròv $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu a$ ，and the reason why it is used there
 roús should be added before á $\mu \phi$ о́є́pous．On the other hand there are several passages in which àvaүкaiov stands before a consonant．

For aủrôv used pleonastically in addition to the relative， cp ． Plato，Rep． 395 D，and Stallbaum＇s notes on this passage and on Gorg． $45^{2}$ D．The same usage occurs in English，e．g．in＇Who is the poet but lately arrived in Elysium whom I saw Spenser lead in and present him to Virgil？＇（Lyttelton＇s Dialogues of the Dead）．

 but хрク́бヶцóv є่ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu . ~ S e e ~ h o w e v e r ~ V a h l e n, ~ A r i s t o t . ~ A u f s . ~ 2 . ~ 24 ~ s q q ., ~$ who adduces other passages（Pol． 7 （5）．9．13 го а 2 sqq．： 7 （5）． 10．13rob 9 sqq．：De An．2．5． 417 a 22 sqq．）in which the second limb of an antithesis suffers a similar change，and is caught into the structure of an intervening sentence．

11．єi $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ к．т．入．Menand．Monost． 579 is in the same spirit：

13．${ }^{\text {on }} \lambda \omega \boldsymbol{\omega} \tau \in$ k．$\tau . \lambda .$, ＇and broadly it is manifest that we shall say that the best state of every individual thing，if we match one against another，corresponds in respect of superiority to the distance between the things of which we say that these very states are states，＇i．e．if we match two things one against the other，the superiority of the best state of the one thing over the best state of the other corresponds to the distance between the one thing and the other．＂O $\omega \omega$ s marks a transition from statements as to this or that class of goods to a broad universal proposition as to є̈каттоข $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a: ~ s e e ~ a b o v e ~ o n ~ 1262 ~ b ~ 3 . ~ F o r ~ e ́ к a ́ \sigma т о и ~ \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a т о s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~$ ä $\lambda \lambda \eta \lambda \mu$ Vahlen compares among other passages Poet．23．1459a 24，

 In Pol． 4 （7）．14．1332 b 15 sq．and Eth．Nic．2．1．1103b 23 we find áкo入ovéiv followed by кaтá，and many have connected it here with katì $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ímefox $\dot{\eta} \nu$ ，but Vahlen（whose interpretation I have
followed）is probably right in connecting ákoдov $\theta \in i v$ with $\tau \hat{\eta}$ ôıa⿱宀тá⿱㇒日ध

 reading of $\Pi^{1}$ ）is shown by Vahlen（Aristot．Aufs．2． 30 ），who compares among many other passages Plato，Tim． 65 A ，ö $\sigma a$ ò
 $\sigma \epsilon \iota s$ à $\theta$ óas каì катà $\mu \epsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda a$ ．
 Symp． 210 B，and Protag． $3^{1} 3$ A．When Alcestis says in Eurip． Alcest． 292 Bothe， 3 I I Dindorf，
$\psi v \chi \eta ̂ s ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ o u ̛ ס \epsilon ́ v ~ \epsilon ̇ \sigma \tau \iota ~ \tau \iota \mu เ \omega ่ \tau \epsilon \rho o \nu$,
she means by $\psi v \chi \eta$＇life．＇
17．каì $\dot{\circ} \pi \lambda \omega ิ s$ каi $\eta \dot{\eta} \mu \mathrm{v}$ ．Cp．Eth．Nic．5．2． 1129 b 5 and Rhet． 3．19． 1419 b 16 sq．
 à $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ of $\kappa \tau \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma \iota$ in 1.13 .1259 b 20.



кaì тоû трáттєьv катà таútas．An important addition．Hitherto we have been told only this，that those who are to be happy must possess as much virtue as possible，but now we are told that action in accordance with the virtues is also essential to happiness，and this is not lost sight of in the sequel（cp． $3^{\mathrm{I}-36,4 \mathrm{I}} \mathrm{sqq}$ ．）．
 Deity in proof of this．＇Vict．＇quod inquit posse nos hoc videre utentes Deo teste，non intellexit debere nos adhibere ipsum testem et quasi invocare ut hoc confirmet，sed uti illo tanquam signo quodam certo et exemplo huius rei claro atque illustri．＇Mápropı $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \theta a i \quad \tau \iota \nu \iota$ is commonly used in the sense of＇producing some one


 olourat kupious cìvat $\mu$ áprupas $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~ \hat{\eta}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．or as＇testes＇in Cic．De Fin．2．33．ro9．Cp．also Metaph． 1. I． 1069 a 25.
 and nature of the happiness of God，cp．Eth．Eud．7．12． 1245 b 18 ，




28. 'In the earlier days of Greece eìoaí $\mu \nu$ would hardly be used of a deity, as we can easily understand if we look to the original meaning of the word; later also it appears to have gone out of use again to some extent as an epithet of the gods. On the other hand we often find it thus used by Plato and other writers of his time (see Ast, Lexicon Platonicum). I have found it elsewhere in

 eival, and' in the passage of the Politics before us (Heinze, Der Eudämonismus in der griech. Philosophie, 1. 663).
26. èmei kai k.t.. ., 'since it is just on account of this' (i.e. because happiness does not spring from external goods) 'that prosperity also differs from happiness [no less than external goods differ from goods of the soul], for the spontaneous and fortune are the cause of goods external to the soul [the abundance of which constitutes prosperity], whereas no one is just or temperate [or consequently happy] from fortune or owing to fortune.' 'Etei introduces a justification of the statement that the happiness of the individual is proportionate to his virtue and moral prudence and to the degree in which he acts in accordance with them: if this were not so and his happiness sprang from external goods, it would not differ from prosperity. That prosperity consists in an abundance of external goods, we see from Rhet. r. 5. 1361 b 39, eỉvuxia
 $\tau \grave{a} \pi \lambda \epsilon \bar{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a \hat{\eta} \geqslant \grave{\alpha} \mu^{\prime} \hat{\prime} \gamma \sigma \tau a$. That it was identified by many with happiness we see from Eth. Nic. 1. 9. 1099 b 7 sq. and 7. 14. 1153 b 21 sqq.
28. As to тaủvópatov кai ๆ̀ túx $\eta$ see vol, i. p. 2 I sqq.

 the sake of emphasis: cp. Plut. De Fortuna, c. y, đótepò oùdè̀


 Фi入i $\pi$ тov $\pi$ óp
 same arguments to establish it, comes the truth that the best State also is happy and does well.' But it cannot do well-Aristotle in effect proceeds-unless it does noble things, and it cannot do noble things without moral and intellectual virtue, and the courage,
justice, and wisdom of a State are identical in nature with the same virtues in an individual, so that the happiness of a State, like that of an individual, cannot exist apart from the moral and intellectual virtues and action in accordance with them; its happiness is inseparable from the very same virtues with which happiness is associated in the individual. Bernays and Susemihl, who substitute
 $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu, 3^{6}$, as containing the proof of the preceding sentence €́ $\chi \dot{\circ} \mu \in \nu o \nu, 29-\kappa a \lambda \hat{\omega} s, 3 \mathbf{r}$, but Vahlen has already pointed out (Aristot. Aufs. 2.45 sq.) that the former passage is rather a deduction from
latter. The arguments used in the passage $3^{1-36}$ are not the same as those used in $13^{2} 3$ a $3^{8-b} 29$, nor do they prove that the best State is happy; what is proved in $3^{1-36}$ is that the happy State will possess the same courage, justice, temperance, and wisdom which are possessed by the virtuous individual. One can conceive that the State might be happy without possessing the virtues of the virtuous individual ; the object of $31-36$ is to show that this is not the case, and that any happy State must possess these virtues, and thus to supplement and complete 29-31. It follows that the best State will possess them. In saying that the courage, justice, temperance, and wisdom of a State are identical with the courage, justice, temperance, and wisdom of an individual Aristotle follows in the track of Plato, Rep. 435 B sq. and 44 I C sq.
 Gorg. 507 C.



35. $\mu \circ \rho \phi \eta \eta^{\nu}$. Bonitz (Ind. s.v.) remarks of this passage, ' $\mu \circ \rho \phi \eta^{\prime}$ idem fere quod סóvauts significat.'

The suppressed antecedent of $\hat{\omega} \nu$ must be $\tau \hat{\eta}$ àvópiạ каì $\delta \iota \kappa a t o \sigma u ́ v \eta$
 place of díkuьos каì фрóvıцоs каì $\sigma \dot{\omega} \phi \rho \omega \nu$, but Aristotle is not careful of exact correspondence in enumerations of this kind, as Vahlen shows by comparing Eth. Nic. 1. 13. 1103 a 4-8, Pol. I. I3. 1259 b 39-1260 a 2, Pol. 6 (4). x1. 1295 b 6-9, and Pol. 3. 12. 1282 b 361283 a 3, where we expect $\tau 0 \hat{v}$ кád $\lambda$ ous in place of $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \lambda$ оúтov in 1283 a 2. The same thing is observable in Plato: see Stallbaum on Plato, Rep. 490 C.
37. $\mu \epsilon ́ v$ is probably answered not by $\delta \epsilon \in$ in $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta_{\epsilon} \dot{v} \pi о к \epsilon i \sigma \theta \omega, 40$,
 2. 25).

тєфрогцıаб $\mu$ éva. Not only what has been said on this subject, but the whole contents of the first three chapters are introductory, because they merely prepare the way for the inquiry with which Aristotle is mainly concerned, the inquiry as to the best constitution (cp. c. 2. 1324a 19 sqq., c. 4. 1325 b 33 sqq.).
38. $\theta$ tyyávelw ' is rare in the best Prose (äntoual being the common verb), but is used by Xenophon, Cyrop. 1. 3. 5, 5. 1. 16, 6. 4. 9, and by Aristotle ' (Liddell and Scott s.v.). See also Rutherford, New Phrynichus, pp. 169, 39 r. ' $E \pi \in \epsilon \in \in \lambda \in \epsilon \bar{i}$ (aor. infin.) is used though $\theta$ rryávelv (pres. infin.) has preceded, probably because $\grave{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon \xi \in \xi \rho-$ $\chi^{\ell \in \sigma \theta a}$ is not used in this sense.





40. $\mu$ év should rather follow $\mathfrak{i \pi}$ oкei $\boldsymbol{i} \theta \omega$, but ' $\mu$ év interdum non ei additur vocabulo in quo vis oppositionis cernitur' (Bon. Ind. s. v.).
 10. $9.1179 \mathrm{a}_{4}$ sqq. Xenocrates, on the other hand, had identified the good and the happy life, and his view is consequently corrected


 that of the Cynics, for they held that virtue needed only the addition of the strength which Socrates possessed to be sufficient for



1. The suppressed subject of $\mu \epsilon \tau \in ́ \chi \in \iota \nu$ probably is, not tò̀ $\beta i=\nu$, but 1324 a . є̈кабтоу каі та̀s по́入єıs.
2. $\epsilon \in \pi i$ i $\mathfrak{\imath} \mathrm{S}$ vûv $\mu \in \theta$ ó $\delta o u$, 'for the time of the present inquiry':


3. Пótepor $\delta$ è к.т.ג. Aristotle has just said that the courage, C.2. justice, etc., of a State are the same as the corresponding virtues in an individual, and now he asks whether this is also true of happiness. The question marked out for inquiry in 1323 a 20 sq.,

far answered that we have been told that the most desirable life both for the State and for the individual is $\mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime} \dot{a} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} s$, but we have not yet learnt whether the happiness of the State resembles the happiness of the individual ( 1323 b 2 I sqq.) in springing from virtue and being proportionate to it, and, till we know this, we cannot affirm that the happiness of the State and that of the individual are the same. We are now told that this is the case
 tarch claims that Lycurgus was already aware of this (Lycurg.

 often seems tacitly to defend Lycurgus against Aristotle's criticisms (see notes on 1270 a 4,19 , and $1_{3} 2^{4}$ b 7 ).
4. ảmoঠéXєтal, 'accipit cum assensu, probat' (Bon. Ind. s.v.). Cp. 2. 6. 1265 a 25.

 raised and the parties to the discussion, see vol. i. p. 305 sqq.
 Aristotle probably has before him not only the language of

 Anaxagoras, who lived many years at Athens, though a Clazomenian, and when he was forced to leave it, did not return to his native city, but preferred to live a stranger's life at Lampsacus and died there (Rhet. 2. 23. 1398 b I5).


 a State (cp. 15 ).


 $P^{4.6} L^{8}$ omit $\gamma \alpha ́ \rho$ and Vet. Int. has no equivalent for it (Vet. Int. occasionally fails to render fáp: see vol. ii. p. lxiii). 「áp should probably be retained in the text, and if we retain it, we must place
 introduced by $\dot{\epsilon \pi \epsilon \epsilon}$, the apodosis is often introduced by ov̉v in Aristotle's writings (see Bonitz, Aristot. Studien, 2. 59 sqq.). In c. I3. I33I b 26 sqq. and in De An. I. 4. 408 a 5 sqq. the
apodosis is introduced by $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ oûv after a protasis introduced by èrei or $\epsilon$.

 andi actio' (i.e. 'thought'), referring to Metaph. E. r. 1025 b 6, $\pi$ ẫa
 sq., and De Interp. 14. 23 a 32 sq.



 also De Gen. An. 4. 4. 772 a 2.



 of $\pi a \rho a ́ ~ s e e ~ K u ̈ h n e r, ~ A u s f u ̈ h r l . ~ g r . ~ G r a m m ., ~ e d . ~ 2, ~ § ~ 440 ~ a . ~ r . ~$.


 he declines to identify this kind of life exclusively with the philosophic life. He selects three strong assertions for review, each containing the word $\mu$ óvov, and this is the first of them. The other

 $\phi a \sigma v, 1324$ b 2. As to the passage before us cp. c. 3.1325 a 18 ,


 something more than a mere rejection of political office ; Aristotle probably has Anaxagoras in his mind, his refusal to be cumbered even with property, his passion for $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho i a$ and ${ }_{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \rho i a:$ compare the account of Anaxagoras in Plut. Pericl. c. 16, where avópyavov каi

 1088 R (quoted by Menage on Diog. Laert. 2. 6), where $\pi$ áorıs
 same phrase, and in Diog. Laert. 2. 6, oûros (i.e. 'Avağayópas) Eìyevéia





 1179 a 13 sqq.: Eth. Eud. I. 4. 1215 b 6 sqq. and I. 5. 1216 a 10 sqq. Aristotle, however, may also be thinking of Empedocles (cp. Diog. Laert. 8. 63, quoted below on 1325 a 19). ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \nu$ ~óvò $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon ́ s$ фабьv єivaı фı入óroфov perhaps contains a reminiscence of Plato,




 hints in these words that it is possible to lead a philosophic life without withdrawing altogether from politics; he probably remembers that Socrates, Archytas, and Epaminondas had done so. Cp. Plut. An Seni sit gerenda Respublica, c. 26, much of which chapter is thought by Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2.2.892. I (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. ii. p. 44 I, note I), to be based, in sub-





 34. 137 , septem fuisse dicuntur uno tempore, qui sapientes et haberentur et vocarentur. Hi omnes praeter Milesium Thalen civitatibus suis pracfuerunt. Plato, again, though he speaks of the true philosopher as scorning political office (Rep. 521 A sq .), will not hear of his philosophic class refusing political office, at any rate in his ideal State. Cp. also Gorg. 500 D. Chrysippus was so far from thinking the $\sigma$ रo ${ }^{\text {dartıòs }}$ Bios the only one fit for a philosopher that he classed it as an $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \iota \kappa$ òs $\beta$ ios (Plut. De Stoicor. Repugnantiis, c. 2).
 фi入oбофov̂oıv. For oi фıлотıцótaтoı $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \rho \epsilon \tau i ́ v, ~ c p . ~(w i t h ~ E a t o n) ~ 5 ~(8) . ~$.
 ' evidently choose.'
5. кaì т $\omega v$ тротє́ $\rho \omega \nu$ (e.g. Anaxagoras and, as we shall see, Gorgias) каì т $\boldsymbol{\omega} \nu$ vûv (e.g. Isocrates and Epaminondas). ol
$\pi р о ́ т \epsilon \rho 0$ does not，I think，occur elsewhere in the Politics（oi $\pi \rho \dot{\tau} \notin \rho \cap y$ is the usual phrase），but it occurs in Plato，Phaedr． 274 B and Menex． 24 I D．
$\lambda \in ́ \gamma \omega$ סè ठúo к．т．入．See critical note．
 him the words of Socrates in Plato，Gorg． 500 C ，ópậs $\gamma \dot{a} \rho$ ö ô $\iota \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$


 філобофía．

33．ảvá $ү к \eta$ үà $\rho$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Aristotle perhaps remembers Plato，Rep．

 éкáбтоиs к．т．入．（cp．Laws 702 A sub fin．）．

35．vоцí＇̧ova九 $\delta$＇oi $\mu \grave{̀} \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．It is possible that Anaxagoras had expressed himself to this effect：he seems at any rate to have implied in his account of the happy man that he was not a $\delta v \nu a ́ \sigma \tau \eta s$ （Eth．Nic．ro．9．II79 a 13 sqq．）．Isocrates had said in his Letter


 spurious Fourth Philippic ascribed to Demosthenes，c．70．As Eaton points out，Plato had already made Thrasymachus in Rep． 344 A sqq．speak of $\tau v p a \nu v i s$ as $\dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \omega \tau \alpha \dot{\tau} \eta \eta$ ảoıkia：cp．also Gorg．



 tivat $\tau \hat{\eta} s \mu \epsilon \gamma i \sigma \tau \eta s$（＇accompanied with injustice of the very greatest

 Soph．O．C． 560 ，and see Liddell and Scott，s．v．tis A．ii． 8.

37．$\pi \mathbf{\pi} \iota \tau \iota \kappa \omega \hat{s} \delta \epsilon ́$ ，i．e．if rule is exercised as it should be exer－ cised over men free and equal（cp．3．4． 1277 b 7 sqq．：1． 7 ． 1255 b 20）．


 contrast to $\dot{\eta}$ є́кто̀s єü $\eta \mu \epsilon \rho i a$（health，food，etc．），Eth．Nic．10． 9. 1178 b 33 sqq．
 takes a dative in Pol. 7 (5). II. 1314 a 3 I.
39. $\mu$ óvov ү $\dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. This was the view of Gorgias as expressed
 $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ $\pi \rho \dot{\prime} \tau \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ (and perhaps also of Prodicus and Protagoras, Rep. 600 C sq.) : compare what Socrates says to Callicles, the



 himself says in Gorg. 485 D of one who continues to study philosophy after he has ceased to be young, ímápхєt тоúт由 т@̣

 yíyvє $\begin{aligned} & \text { at к.т.ג., and Hipp. Maj. 28ı B sq. Gorgias formed himself }\end{aligned}$ (Hipp. Maj. 282 B) and his disciples (Xen. Anab. 2. 6. 16) on this model; his ideal of human life stood in the strongest possible contrast to that of Anaxagoras. Nowhere can it have found more sympathy than at Athens (cp. Thuc. 2. 40). The added remark

 Gorgias. In 2. 2. 126 I b I (cp. 3. 6. 1279 a 8 sqq.) Aristotle leaves the question open whether ruling is a good thing or not.


 Aristotle, however, seems to have said, if the $\pi \rho о \tau \rho \epsilon \pi \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s ~ a s c r i b e d ~ t o ~$ him was really his, that Kings were favourably circumstanced for philosophizing (Fragm. 47. 1483 a 4 I sqq.) : compare the view of Marcus Aurelius (Comm. II. 7), and contrast Plut. Ad Princ. Inerud. c. 5, where Plutarch suspects that Alexander was half inclined to regard his own splendour and power $\grave{\omega}$ к $\kappa \dot{\lambda} \lambda v \sigma \iota \nu$ àpeт $\eta$ s каì $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi \chi^{\circ} \dot{\lambda} a \nu$. For $\dot{\epsilon} \pi i$ with the gen. in the sense of 'in respect of,'


1324 b. 2. oi $\delta \mathbf{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. By 'the despotic and tyrannical form of the constitution' Aristotle means a form of constitution devised $\pi \rho$ òs rò кратєì каì $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \dot{\sigma} \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \in \lambda a s$. No notice is taken of those who praised the life of the tyrant, probably because no one would claim
that the tyrant was alone happy. For т тómov т $\eta$ s $\pi$ oोıтєias, cp. 2. 5 .

 monian constitution are probably referred to (see c. 14. 1333 b 18 sqq.), for they seem to have called the Lacedaemonian State happy because it ruled over many, and to have ascribed its happiness to the framer of its constitution ( 1333 b 22 sq., 29 sqq.). Aristotle may have thought that Alexander needed warning on the subject (cp. Plut. De Tranq. An. c. 13 : Aristot. Fragm. 6ı4. $55^{81}$ b 18 sqq.).
3. $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ éviols $\delta \dot{\text { è }}$ к.т. $\lambda$., ' and in some States this is the distinctive aim both of the constitution and of the laws, that the members of the State may exercise a despotic rule over others.' In the Lacedaemonian and Cretan States, for instance, both constitution and laws were framed with this end in view (c. 14. 1333b5 sqq.): For ofpos
 vioó $\theta \in \sigma \iota$ in 7 (5). II. I3I4 a 27 sqq.
 roîs $\pi \lambda$ єírтoıs. $K a i=' t h o u g h ': ~ c p . ~ X e n . ~ H e l l . ~ 3.5 .2, ~ ' A \theta \eta \nu a i o u ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$
 and see Liddell and Scott s.v.. kaí B. ii. 4.
$\nu \propto \mu \dot{\mu} \mu \nu=\nu \dot{\prime} \mu \omega \nu$ : ср. 2. 8. 1268 b 42 and 1269 a i, and see Bon. Ind. s. v. $\nu o ́ \mu \iota \mu o s$.



7. $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. The same thing is said in 4 (7). 14. 1333 b 5 sqq. and of Lacedaemon in 2.9.127 b 2 sqq.: cp. also 1325 a 3 , and Plato, Laws 626 A , кaì $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \grave{\partial} \nu$ ảעєvр $\eta \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s$ ои̃т $\sigma к о \pi \hat{\omega} \nu$ тò̀ $\mathrm{K} \rho \eta \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

 so from the part of the Code of Gortyna which has come down to us, but the account of Cretan institutions given in Strab. p. 480 on the authority of Ephorus so far bears out the testimony of Plato and Aristotle, that it represents the development of courage in the young citizens to have been one main aim of the constitution. Plutarch probably has similar charges before him when in Lycurg. c. 3 I and Ages. c. 33 he tries to make out that the aim of Lycurgus was very much that which Plato and Aristotle said that it ought to have been (see above on 1324 a 5). For $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \tau \epsilon \pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a$ кai $\tau$ ò $\tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ $\nu o ́ \mu \omega \nu \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os, cp. c. 14. 1333b 9, тoùs עó $\mu$ ovs кaì т $̀ \nu \pi a \iota \delta \in i a \nu$. For тò
$\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{\mu} \mu \omega \nu \nu \lambda \grave{\eta} \theta_{0} s$, 'most of the laws,' Bonitz (Ind. 603 b I\% sqq.) compares 6 (4).4. 1290 a 31, 32 and 2. 5. 1264 a 13.
 are capable of winning at the expense of others warlike prowess is honoured.' Aristotle has before him Hdt. 2. 167, ó $\bar{\epsilon} \omega \nu$ кaì Өр $і$ ïкas
 the Lydians) каì $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \partial ̀ \nu ~ \pi a ́ v \tau a s ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ \beta a p \beta a ́ p o v s ~ a ̀ \pi o \tau \mu \mu \tau e ́ \rho o v s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$



 from the barbarians to the Lacedaemonians, just as in the passage before us there is a transition from the Lacedaemonians to the barbarians. He probably also has before him Plato, Laws 637 D,





 $\mathrm{I}_{3} 18 \mathrm{~b} 4$, where of kparov̀ves takes its place in the next line: cp.

 Europe in Aristotle's day, as among those of Africa in our own, there were raiding and raided races. 'H тotaúr ס ס̀vaauıs, i. e. $\dot{\eta} \pi o \lambda \epsilon-$
 13). Thus $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon}^{\mu} \mu \nu \nu$ is emphatic in 16 and 18 , and $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \omega \omega$
 and see Holden's note on Xen. Oecon. 9. 4, àvaє́єтtaata.
12. каì vómot twés cíol, 'laws also ' providing for the giving of honours, as well as honours. The honours might be given apart from any provisions of law.
 receive, we are told, their decoration composed of armlets with as many armlets as they have served campaigns.' Coray would read ék тобоútav крiкшข, but Vahlen (Aristot. Aufs. 2. 34) rightly disapproves of this attempt to secure a more exact correspondence between antecedent and relative. I translate крiккv 'armlets,' not 'rings,' for the kpikos which Demosthenes wore was not a ring

 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota$ ßpaxıónıov: cp. Dec. Orat. Vit. Demosth. 847 B), and those worn by Carthaginian soldiers may well have been so too. Compare the armillae given to Roman soldiers for brilliant feats of arms (Liv. 10. 44 : Guhl and Koner, Life of the Greeks and Romans, Eng. Trans. p. 586). We hear very little of similar rewards for gallant service in Greece. It was with land that Pittacus was rewarded for slaying his antagonist Phrynon (Plut. De Herod. Malign. c. I5). It was not by rewards given to the brave but by the education of youth that the Lacedaemonians and Cretans developed military prowess in their citizens. The Carthaginian custom may have been derived from the Libyans around them (cp. Hdt. 4. I76), or possibly from Egypt (Sext. Empir. Pyrrh. Hypotyp. 3. 20r, p. 168. 25 sqq. Bekker). It seems likely from the passage before us that the decoration of крiкo was confined to citizens of Carthage and was intended to induce them to serve in war and not to leave military service to mercenaries.
15. $\eta^{\nu} \nu \bar{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda .$, 'and there was at one time a law in Macedon also that he who had slain no foeman should be girded with his halter (instead of a belt).' A man girded with a halter would cut a sorry figure beside one girded with a handsome belt adorned with metal, and possibly golden, buckles (Guhl and Koner, Eng. Trans. p. 235). Among the Cappadocians to wear a belt meant to be an officer (Anth. Pal. ir. $23^{8}$ : Liddell and Scott s.v. $\zeta \dot{\omega} \eta \eta$ ). Compare the Macedonian custom mentioned by Hegesander,


 a brave man and a skilful hunter, had not been able to fulfil this requirement at the age of thirty-five and still sat at dinner. A closer parallel may be found in the iron ring worn by many of the Chatti till they had slain an enemy in war (Tac. Germ. c. 3 r, et aliis Germanorum populis usurpatum raro et privata cuiusque audentia apud Chattos in consensum vertit, ut primum adoleverint, crinem barbamque submittere, nec, nisi hoste caeso, exuere votivum obligatumque virtuti oris habitum . . . Fortissimus quisque ferreum insuper anulum (ignominiosum id genti) velut vinculum gestat, donec se caede hostis absolvat. Plurimis Chattorum hic placet habitus). Similar customs are traceable among the Sauromatae (Nic. Damasc. Fragm. 122 : Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 3. 460). 'It is a rule
among all the tribes' [of the head-hunting Malays of Borneo] 'that no youth can regularly wear a mandau (sword) or be married or associate with the opposite sex, till he has been on one or more head-hunting expeditions. A mandau is presented to him probably at his birth or when he receives a name, but not till he has washed it in the blood of an enemy can he presume to carry it as part of his every-day equipment' (Bock, Head-hunters of Borneo, p. 216). Under Cetewayo, a Zulu who had not 'washed his spear,' that is, who had not killed an enemy, could not marry. We light on a more genial form of the same custom in the island of Skye. ' In Dunvegan Castle is kept an ox's horn, hollowed so as to hold perhaps two quarts' (of what liquid?) 'which the heir of Macleod was expected to swallow at one draught as a test of his manhood, before he was permitted to bear arms or could claim a seat among the men' (Dr. Johnson's Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland, Works, 8. 289).
17. $\grave{\epsilon} \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ Ekúdars к.т.入. Now we pass from laws to customs (cp. 22). The result is attained by law at Carthage and in Macedon, by custom among the Scythians and Iberians. Eaton compares Hdt. 4. 66 , where however there is no mention of the $\sigma$ кúpos $\pi \epsilon \rho \emptyset \epsilon \rho \dot{\rho} \mu \epsilon \nu$ оs, so that it is doubtful whether Aristotle derives his statement from this source. See however above on 1262 a 19 ,
 and country people (Athen. Deipn: 498 f ) and is quite in place among the Scythians: some, in fact, imagined an etymological connexion between okí申os and $\Sigma_{k i} \theta_{n s}$ (Athen. Deipn. 499 f). For $\pi i v e l \nu$ aкúqov Eaton compares Hom. Il. 8. 232,


 note. A similar custom existed among the Sindi, a Scythian race dwelling at the foot of the Caucasus on the East coast of the Euxine (Nic. Damasc. Fragm. 121 : Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 3. 460,


 word $\dot{\boldsymbol{\beta}} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \mathrm{kos}$ is usually explained here as meaning 'an obelisk,' but this use of it is rare, and if we explain it thus, we must suppose that a long pointed stone is referred to, for soldiers after a battle would not find it easy to set up real obelisks at the grave
of a comrade. It is possible that the word should be translated here 'a small spit.' This is its usual meaning, and every soldier had a small spit ready to hand (Plut. Reg. et Imperat. Apophthi, Scipio Minor 16, zor B). Spits might be thought likely to be useful to the dead man, like the fish thrown on the grave by the Sindi. I am glad to see since the foregoing words were written, that Dr. Jackson also translates ${ }^{\boldsymbol{o} \beta \in \lambda i \sigma r o v e}$ ' spits' (see his note in Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ). Professor Ridgeway (Academy, Aug. 29, 1885), rendering the word 'obelisk,' makes the interesting suggestion that the passage before us throws light on the original purpose of stone circles. I read in the Athenaeum for Dec. $14, \mathbf{1 8 9 5}$, that 'at Monte Pitti in the province of Pisa, near some remains of ancient walls, an Etruscan necropolis has been discovered, the tombs of which are enclosed in circles of rude stones.' See also Dr. Thurnam, Ancient British Barrows in Archaeologia 42, p. 211 , quoted by Prof. Boyd Dawkins, Early Man in Britain, p. 285, and the remarks of Mr. Arthur Evans quoted by Prof. Windle, Life in Early Britain, p. 54 sq. We expect $\delta \iota \epsilon \phi \theta a p \kappa \omega ̀ s ~ \eta j$, not $\delta u \phi \theta \in i p \eta$, for the destruction of the foe must necessarily precede the fixing of the $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \boldsymbol{\beta} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{i} \sigma \kappa 0$, but compare the use of the present participle in 2. 8. 1268 a 8, кai тoîs
 The present is probably used in these passages because a thing occurring frequently is referred to. That the Iberians were a warlike race, had been remarked by Plato, Laws 637 D, and
 ßapßápov $\mu а \chi \nLeftarrow \omega т$ тáтovs): compare the story told in Diod, 14. 75. 8 of their gallant behaviour when deserted by the Carthaginians. Aristotle mentions the fact, partly in confirmation of the statement in 10 that it is among warlike races that these customs prevail, partly because the Iberians were little known to the Greeks, though they had been mentioned by Hecataeus, Herodotus, and Thucydides. They must have become better known in Greece after their employment as mercenaries by Dionysius the Elder, and still more after the arrival in Greece of a contingent of Celtic and Iberian mercenaries sent by him in b.c. 369 to aid the Lacedaemonians against the Thebans (Xen. Hell. 7. 1. 20). It is possible indeed that an Iberian belonging to this contingent may have been buried in Greece in the manner here described by Aristotle.
 classical authors' (Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective,

 As to $\delta$ eıkvíovat see Bon. Ind. 167 b 50 sqq., and cp. 2. 12.1274 a 36. As to óhuviovar see note on 1285 b ir.
21. каі ётєра $\delta \grave{\eta}$ к.т.入. For каi ... $\delta \dot{\eta}$, see above on 1253 a 18 . Nó $\mu o t s ~ к а т \epsilon \lambda \lambda \mu \mu e ́ v a, ~ ' r a t i f i e d ~ b y ~ l a w s, ' ~ c p . ~ P l a t o, ~ L a w s ~ 823 ~ A, ~$

 Prof. J. C. Wilson on Eth. Nic. 10. 10. 1179 b 16 sqq. in Academy, Feb. 18, 1888.
24. The suppressed nominative to äpXn is probably not $\delta$ mòıtıkós, but $\tau \iota s$ : see as to this use of the third person singular Bon. Ind. 589 b 47 sqq.
 argument, for it is still more difficult to suppose that what is not

 Ëкаaтov toútov סíkauov єivaı фaبév, and Eurip. Ion 404 Bothe (442 Dind.),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \pi \omega ิ s \text { oủ̀ סíkatov roùs עómovs víâs ßpotoîs }
\end{aligned}
$$

 justly but unjustly, and it is possible to conquer [and so to acquire rule] unjustly as well as justly,' so that it is possible to rule over unwvilling subjects unjustly. This is added because some held that Might is Right (1. 6. 1255 a 18). Conquering (тò кpareiv) is the first step to ruling over others (c. 14. I333 b 30). Oủ עóцццод ס̀́,

 1300 b 34), etc.
29. тoùro, i. e. that it is the function of the master of the art to rule over unwilling, no less than willing, subjects.
 over the unwilling, for they are the characteristics of despotic rule :



 contemplates the use of persuasion and force by the physician in Laws 720 D and Polit. 296 B (cp. Gorg. 456 B), but perhaps
he would not dispute what Aristotle here says, that the function of the physician, qua physician, is not to persuade or coerce, but to heal (cp. Rep. 488, esp. D-E). Cp. also Athen. Deipn. 427 f sq.





 $\sigma$ oúv, and 1. 6.1255 b 6 sqq. Thus Aristotle urged Alexander to rule the Greeks $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \nu \nu \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} s$ and the barbarians only $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \tau \kappa \bar{\omega} s$ (Aristot. Fragm. 81. $1489 \mathrm{~b}_{27} \mathrm{sqq}$. ), perhaps remembering the advice of


 a rule only animals fit to be eaten were offered in sacrifice, though it is true that dogs were sacrificed to Hecatê and that some other exceptions to the rule occur (C. F. Hermann, Gr. Ant. 2. § 26).
41. ${ }^{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta े \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle no doubt has before him the State



 playfully compares his best State in c. 15 . I334a 28 sqq.) lay far away from men: cp. Hesiod, Op. et Dies, 167 ,


It was a situation of this kind that the Phaeacians were taught by experience to seek out: cp. Hom. Odyss. 6. 2,

$$
\text { aùrà }{ }^{\prime} \text { ' } A \theta \dot{\prime} \nu \eta
$$







 34 sqq., etc.

 and studies with a view to war are to be considered noble, they are not to be so considered as being the highest end of all, but as existing for the sake of that end.' That they are not the highest end of all, or in other words that they do not constitute happiness, is evident because happiness is attainable by States in which they are not practised, and also because they are not the "pyov rov
 There were probably those who regarded 'cares and studies with a view to war' as the highest end of all; thus an admirer of the Lacedaemonians claims in Isocr. Panath. § 202 that gratitude is



 ör $\iota$ see critical note.
 see with respect to a State and a race of men and every other association how they are to share [not in conquest, but] in good life and the measure of happiness attainable by them.' Cp. Plato, Laws 631 B , where happiness is implied to be the end of laws, and



 here, because he has had both in view in his criticisms ( 1324 b 3 sqq.). It should be noticed that he regards the ${ }^{*}$ 'vos as a kind of
 cp. Plato, Rep. $4{ }^{13}$ C, тоиิтo ต́s поıтtóò.
10. $\delta$ เoícet $\mu$ éviou к.т..., i.e. though this will always be the end at which he aims, the laws by which he seeks to attain it will differ according as his State has neighbours or not. If it has no neighbours, his laws will be less directed to the encouragement of


11. каì тоиิто к.т. ג., ' and it is the province of the legislative art, if the State has neighbours, to consider this, [not how to subjugate them all indiscriminately, but] what sort of studies should be practised in relation to each sort of neighbour, or how the State is to adopt the measures which are appropriate in relation to each of

 not lay down one indiscriminating rule，as the Lacedaemonian law－ giver had done，but rather a rule varying according to the character of the neighbours with whom the State has to deal．Hoia means
 the lawgiver will teach his State to practise military studies in relation to aggressive neighbours or neighbours who deserve to be
 $\chi \not \equiv \eta \sigma \tau \in ́ \sigma$ is a wider inquiry than $\pi o i ́ a \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi o i o u s ~ c i \sigma \kappa \eta \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma \nu$ ，and includes the whole subject of the action of the State in relation to its neighbours both in peace and in war，which of them should be ruled $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \dot{\nu} \iota \kappa \omega ิ s$ and which $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ отєкิิs，how war should be waged with them，if they are Greeks（cp．Plato，Rep． 471 A sqq．），and other questions of the same kind．Aristotle evidently does not agree with Isocrates when he says that laws affect only the internal organization of States，and not their mutual relations（De Antid． § 79：see vol．i．p． $55^{2}$ ）．

19．тàs moえıtıkàs ảpxás，so termed，as we see from 3．6．I279 a 8 C． 3. （where see note），in contrast to the ajpxai of the head of a household， a ship－captain，or a training－master，and the like，and also to priesthoods（6（4）．I5．1299a 18）．
$\tau \epsilon$ should follow not $\tau \delta ์ \nu$ ，but $\tilde{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon p o \nu$ ：for other instances of its displacement see Bon．Ind． 749 b 44 sqq．and above on 1259 a 13 ．

тоû è̉ $\lambda \epsilon u \theta \in ́ \rho o u, ~ c p . ~ D i o g . ~ L a e r t . ~ 8 . ~ 63, ~ 申 \eta \sigma i ̀ ~ \delta ’ ~ a u ̉ r o ̀ \nu ~(i . e . ~ E m p e d o-~$








20．With тои̂ тодıтเкои̂ supply $\beta$ iov，as with tov̂ $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi о т \iota к о \hat{v}$ in 24.

ả8úvatov زà $\rho$ к．т．入．Gorgias may probably have used this argument．Aristotle is of the same opinion：cp． 1325 b 14 sqq． and Eth．Nic．1．3． 1095 b 32 sqq．

22．Tท̀ $\delta^{3}$ єủmpayiav к．т．$\lambda_{\text {．，}}$ ，so that one who does nothing cannot

 be often defined as $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \pi \rho a \xi \xi^{\prime} a \mu \in \tau^{\prime} \alpha{ }^{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta \hat{\eta}$ ．

24．oi $\mu \grave{v} \nu$ öть к．т．入．Tô̂ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon \in \rho o v=$ the man who avoids

 position in favour of which Xenophon often makes Hiero argue （e．g．in Hiero 1． 2,7 sqq．）．
 be the function of $\delta \delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ otıós（cp．1．7． 1255 b 33 sqq．：3． 4 ． 1277 a 33 sqq．）．

27．тò $\mu$ évтоi vouíbelv к．т．$\lambda$ ．It is apparently implied that those who rejected political office regarded all rule as despotic，yet in c． 2 ． 1324 a 35 sqq．they are said to have distinguished between despotic and constitutional rule．

 to the $\pi \rho \omega \bar{\tau}$ o $\lambda$ 白 $\begin{gathered}\text { ou might well be taken to show that the Fourth and }\end{gathered}$ Fifth（old Seventh and Eighth）Books do not fall within them，were it not that a similar reference occurs in $3 \cdot 6.1278 \mathrm{~b}$ I 7 sq ．，a chapter which certainly seems to form part of the $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\tau} \boldsymbol{\iota}$ 入óyoı（see vol．ii． p． xxi ）．
 have in them the perfect realization of many things that are noble＇：





34．каíто тáx’ àv к．т．$\lambda$ ．The tyrant Jason is here alluded to （see vol．i．p． 237 ，note I）．A saying of his is mentioned in Rhet． x．12． 1373 a 25 （cp．Plut．Praec．Reip．Gerend．c． 24 and De Sani－
 which no doubt referred to the acquisition of a tyranny．Jason was a great admirer of Gorgias（Paus．6．17．9），and it is possible that Gorgias＇praises of the practical and political life may have influenced him．Be that as it may，Aristotle evidently fears that his own identification of єن̇סacuovia with tò $\epsilon \hat{v} \pi \rho a \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$（for this is what he means by $\tau$ oút $\omega \nu$ oüт $\delta \iota \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu \epsilon ่ \nu \omega \nu, \mathrm{cp} .1325 \mathrm{~b} 14 \mathrm{sq}$ ．）may lead some one to the same conclusion as Jason，but he hastens to explain that absolute power does not bring with it tò єủ $\pi \rho a ́ \pi \tau \epsilon \iota \nu$ ， except in the hands of one who is as superior to those he rules as
a master is to his slaves ( r 325 b 3 sqq.). Aristotle does not dispute that political power makes it easier to do noble things (cp. Eth. Nic. r. 9. 1099 a 32 sqq .), but then political power must not be out of proportion to the worth of its possessor.
 кал $\omega \nu, 32$.
©̈øtє oủ $\delta \in i ̂$ к.т. $\lambda$. Susemihl reads e conj. $\delta \in i ̂ \nu$ for $\delta \epsilon i ̂$, but cp. 2 . 12. 1274 a 5 , where the indirecta oratio is similarly abandoned, though Aristotle is describing the views of others. In the Phoenissae of Euripides Eteocles, who has deprived his brother Polyneices of his share of the Kingship, or Tyranny, of Thebes, refuses to give up the Tyranny to him, and Aristotle no doubt has his famous speech in his memory. He says (470 sqq. Bothe, 504 sqq. Dindorf),





38. каì $\mu \eta$ 'тє $\pi a \tau \epsilon \in \rho \alpha$ паî̀ $\omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. This reads as if Aristotle were quoting from some solemn covenant for the establishment of a tyranny: compare the oath taken in support of Drusus in Diod.


 emphasis, and perhaps with a little surprise, on the loyalty of Gelon to his father Hiero II, tyrant of Syracuse.
39. ©i $\lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$, 'broadly,' not only fathers and children (who are one kind of friends), but friends of all sorts.

mpòs toûto, 'in comparison with this': cp. Eth. Nic. 2. 8. in 108 b i6,
 è $\lambda$ еєítovorv.


 нахทто́татоу.
2. і́тотiӨevtal тоûto $\psi \in \hat{\text { ûठos, ' 'in assuming this as the foundation }}$ of their argument they assume what is false.'
3. oủ $\gamma \grave{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{\rho}$ ërı к.т.т. The reply of the Chorus to the speech of

Eteocles referred to above on $\mathrm{I}_{3} 5^{5}$ a $3^{6}$ (Eurip. Phoeniss. 492 sq. Bothe : $5^{2} 6$ sq. Dind.) is perhaps present to Aristotle's memory:
oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ калòv тоût', à $\lambda \lambda a ̀ ~ \tau \hat{\eta}$ ठíkn $\pi \iota \kappa \rho o ́ v$.

Compare also the remark of Plato to Dionysius the Elder quoted above on 1288 a 4, Hdt. 3. 142, and Eurip. Fragm. 172.
 tò oíkaov is an expression which frequently recurs: cp. Plato, Gorg.


10. Sıò кằvả à $\lambda$ os tıs к.т. $\lambda$. This takes up and corrects $\mathrm{I}_{3} 25$ a $3^{6}$ sqq. Aristotle perhaps remembers the saying of Aristides when he surrendered his day of command at Marathon to Miltiades (Plut.


 é $\sigma \tau \iota$ кaì $\sigma \omega \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \nprec \iota \nu)$. Aristides behaved in just the same way to Themistocles also, serving under him willingly and accepting the second place in the State (Plut. Aristid. c. 8: Aristid. et Cat. inter se comp. c. 5).
 and in the power which is capable of effecting the best things': cp.
 after $\kappa \rho \varepsilon$ हitric and as masc., 'superior to the best men,' but not, I think, rightly. For àpeтì kai סívauıs see above on 1284 a 6 . The repetition of kará may be for the sake of emphasis (kaáa is not

 of both qualifications is evident from 12 sqq. Compare the effect of the repetition of prepositions in 3 . Ir. 128 I b $\mathrm{I}_{5}$, $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{̀}$ đáva


11. For the repetition of roúrẹ see notes on 1317 b 5 and 1284 b 28.
12. $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ i $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т.ג., 'but [if a man is to be followed and obeyed as a sovereign,] he should possess,' etc. So in $7(5) \cdot 9.1309$ a 33 sqq. Aristotle requires of those who are to hold the more important magistracies that they shall possess not only virtue,

existing constitution. Compare Callicles' description of of кpeitrous in Plato, Gorg. 491 A sq.
15. єümpayiav. Aristotle uses both єìmpayia and єủmpagia: 'in Attic prose $\epsilon \dot{\pi} \pi \rho a y i a$ was preferred' (Liddell and Scott).
16. à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ к.т.t. Two separate assertions are here made(1) that activity is not necessarily in relation to others, and (2) that it is not necessarily a means to something else, but that thoughts which are an end in themselves may be of an active type. The first of these two assertions does not seem to be quite in harmony with the spirit at any rate of Eth. Nic. 10. 7.1177 a 30 sqq., but still we gather from Eth. Nic. 5. 3. 1129b 3 r sqq. that

 $\chi р \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$, $\grave{d} \lambda^{\prime}$ oủ $\mu \dot{\partial} \nu_{o v}$ ка $\theta^{\prime}$ aútóv). The second of them clearly

 ópí̧ovtau. But Zeller has already remarked (Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 368. i : Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 400, note 1) that Aristotle sometimes uses the word $\pi \rho \hat{a} \xi \iota s$ in the Nicomachean Ethics in a wider sense than usual, and includes even pure thought under it-e.g. in Eth. Nic. 7. 15. 1154 b 24,
 must refer in $\dot{\eta}$ aủrì $\pi \rho a \hat{\xi} \iota s$ to contemplative activity.
17. каӨámєр oйодтaí tıves. Aristotle probably refers to the persons whose opinion is stated in 1325 a 21 sqq., for they appear to have held that a man who lives a contemplative life does nothing and is not практıkós. Epaminondas was regarded at the outset of his career as à $\pi \rho \dot{a} \gamma \mu \omega \nu$ because he was a philosopher, and was consequently despised (Plut. Pelop. c. 5).
 xápıv, on which it depends, compare c. 4.1326 b 8, ồ $\pi \rho \hat{\text { êtov }} \pi \lambda \hat{\lambda} \theta_{0}$ os
 тод兀тккі̀ коıv
 emphasized by its position in the sentence. Cp. also Hicks, Greek


 óavoias kaì $\theta$ ешрías.
21. $\mathfrak{\eta} \gamma \mathrm{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho$ єủmpagía к.т..д., 'for doing well is the end, and thereVOL. III.
fore there is a kind of action which is the end, [so that there is nothing strange in thoughts which are an end in themselves being active,] and we predicate action also [as well as thought] in the truest and fullest sense, even in the case of actions done in relation to others, of those who as master-agents direct action by their thoughts, [and whose thoughts are therefore more an end in themselves than those of the journeymen they direct].' T $\hat{\omega} \nu$ ' $\xi \xi \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa \omega ิ \nu$ $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \omega \nu$ is in the gen. after ápхıтє́ктораs. For каі $\pi \rho a ́ т \tau \epsilon \iota \nu ~(i . ~ е . ~ \pi р а ́ т-~$
 That the thoughts of a master-agent are more an end in themselves than those of a subordinate, we see from Eth. Nic. 1. I. 1094 a 14 ,

 Aristotle corrects Plato, who in Polit. ${ }^{2} 59$ C, E had identified $\pi \rho а к т \iota к о i$ with $\chi є \iota \rho о т є \chi \nu ו к о i$, and had said that the ápхıтє́ктшу is




 $\sigma \pi \eta \mu \eta s)$. In Eth. Nic. 6. 8. II4i b 24 sqq., however, the word $\pi \rho a \kappa т \iota \kappa$ ós is used in the narrower sense in which Plato had used it in the Politicus, for here $\dot{\eta}$ àpхıгєктоуıкウ̀ фрóvŋбıs is marked off from another kind which is said to be $\pi \rho a \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ (cp. Eth. Eud. г. 6.




23. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \eta ̀ \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Here Aristotle, after proving the second of the two assertions contained in 16 sqq . (oủס̀̀ tàs סtavoias к.т. $\lambda_{\text {. }}$ ),
 eivat $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ érépous). States situated by themselves have already been said not to be necessarily unhappy (c. 2. 1324 b 4 I sqq.), and now they are shown not to be necessarily inactive.

évঠéxєtal $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т.入., 'for this also [as well as other things] can take place by sections [and not alone between whole States].'
 For кат̀̀ $\mu \epsilon^{\prime} \rho \eta$ cp. 8 (6). 8. 1322 a 27 sqq. Among the 'other things' referred to rule would be included, for it was a familiar fact
that rule might be exercised by successive sections of the citizen－ body（ 1325 b 7 sq．）．

26．то入入ai үàp к．т．．．It is implied that，if there are kotvoviat （＇relations＇）between the parts of the State，activity will exist．We may suppose that when the parts of the State have relations with each other，inter－action results or co－operative action or both． What is meant here by the expression＇the parts of the State＇？ Among the parts referred to are probably rulers and ruled：cp．




 16 b 13 and Anal．Pr．2．22． 67 b 28.

28．$\sigma \chi^{0} \lambda \hat{\jmath}$ y ${ }^{\text {àp }}$ к．т．．．．，＇for otherwise God and the whole universe ［could hardly be active，and so］could hardly be well circumstanced ［which all agree that they are］，seeing that they have no actions external to them over and above their internal actions．＇That God is well circumstanced we see from De Caelo，2．12． 292 a 22，絔окє
 consists according to Aristotle of concentric spheres with the earth in the centre（Zeller，Gr．Ph．2． 2.447 sqq．：Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics，Eng．Trans．，vol．i．p． 487 sqq．），and God，who is an incorporeal being distinct from the universe，is outside its outer－ most sphere，so far as an incorporeal being can be said to be in any particular place．He is the First Mover of the universe，but he moves it passively，as the object of love（Metaph． 1.7 .1072 b
 is not to be predicated of him（Eth．Nic．ro．8．1178 b 8 sqq．：De Caelo，2．12．292 a 22 sq．，quoted above）；at least not action in the ordinary sense of the word，for it would be beneath him ；his only activity is thought，and as his thought must be exercised on what is best，it must be exercised on himself（Metaph． 1.9 .1074 b 33，
 Acts of thought exercised by God on himself，therefore，are the oikeial $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \epsilon s$ ascribed to God in the passage before us．But if
 Aristotle＇s view there is but one universe in existence（De Caelo， 1． 8.276 a 18 sqq．：Zeller，Gr．Ph．2．2． 446 sq．－Eng．Trans．， vol．i．p． 485 sq．）；there is nothing corporeal outside the universe，
and therefore nothing on which it can act. Plutarch maintains the opposite view, arguing for a plurality of worlds, in De Defect.



 ко́ $\tau \mu о \nu$. For the contrast here of oiкєios and ${ }^{\prime} \xi \xi \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa o ́ s ~ c p . ~ E t h . ~ N i c . ~$ 5.3 .1129 b 33 , where ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu$ roîs oikeiots stands in opposition to $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \nu$ roîs
 по́лє $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ я.
 $\dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu$ corresponds to $\pi \circ \lambda \iota \tau \omega ิ$, c. $4.13^{2} 5$ b 40 , and also Isocr.
 and Thuc. 6. 18. 7.
C. 4. 33. тєрì aủtติע, cp. Eth. Nic. 6. 4. II40 a 2, $\pi \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon v ่ o \mu \epsilon \nu ~ \delta \grave{~} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{̀}$

 refer to the contents of the Second Book: cp. 2. 1. 1260b 29, $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$

37. oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ oióv $\tau \in$ к.т.入. Cp. 6 (4). I. I2 88 b 39, $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ oi $\mu \in ̀ \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu$

38. Sıò $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ к.т. $\lambda$. See above on 1265 a 17 , where the same remark occurs. We read in Plato, Rep. $45^{6 \mathrm{C}}$, oủk äpa à̊̀́vaтá $\gamma є$

 тout' à 'époov, and these passages agree with that before us in implying that men often pray for impossibilities: yet єüXov סuvavá is one of the Precepts ascribed to the Seven Wise Men in the Collection of Sosiades (Stob. Floril. 3. 80: Mullach, Fragm. Philos. Gr.
 are used more commonly in a middle than in a passive sense (see Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective, pp. 635, 636). The reason of this is, as Richards points out, that кeiogat is used in their place to express the passive.

 the construction of his State in the Laws ( 737 C sqq.) with arrangements respecting these matters, had in Aristotle's opinion (2. 6. 1265 a 10 sqq .) fixed the number of the citizens at an impossibly high figure.
40. $\check{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ үà $\rho$ к.т.ג. Cp. Plato, Laws 709 C sq. (which Aristotle probably has before him), and Xen. Hipparch. 6. r, ả àà $\gamma a ̀ \rho$ oủס̀́v $\nu$


 ӓ $\rho$ оочта к.т. $\lambda$.

5. Ё́TTL $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. , 'and under the head of political equipment falls first [for consideration] the body of men composing the State, how many and what sort of men they should be by nature,' etc. Com-


 necessary to a State' (answering to $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ oikeiav $v \lambda \eta \nu, 4$ ), is different from the equipment necessary to an individual, but both are the gift of Nature and Fortune (c. 13. 133 I b 40 sqq. : $133^{2}$ a 29 sqq., 39 sqq.: 6 (4). II 1295 a 27 sq.). Nature supplies men possessing the needful qualities of body and soul ( 1332 a 40 sqq .), and Fortune supplies external and bodily goods (c. 1. 1323 b 27 sq.). T $\omega \hat{\nu} \dot{a} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu=$ $\pi \sigma \lambda \iota \uparrow ิ \nu, 1325 \mathrm{~b} 40$, and $\tau \omega ิ \nu \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu, ~ c .7 .1328 \mathrm{aI} 7$. Aristotle is not here concerned with the number or quality of the slaves of the State or of its metoeci. As he says that the question of the characteristics of the men and the territory is the first which needs consideration under the head of 'political equipment,' we infer that there are others which need consideration, and what are they? Probably the questions which arise as to the subsidiary classes of cultivators and artisans; these are dealt with in cc. 8-ro. Tıvás in 6 seems to belong both to $\pi$ óvous and to $\pi o i o u s$, and $\tau \iota \nu a ́$ in 8 both

 тє́ тıva каì $\pi$ оía $\tau \iota \nu a ́$, , $\delta \iota \omega ́ \rho \iota \sigma \tau a \iota ~ \sigma \chi \epsilon \delta o ́ \nu$, and c. 10.1329 b 38, каì $\pi o ́ \sigma \eta \nu$ $\tau \iota \nu a ̀ ~ \chi \rho \eta ̀ ~ k a i ̀ ~ \pi o i ́ a \nu ~ \epsilon i v a \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta \nu} \chi$ đ'́pà (so apparently Bonitz, Ind. 533 a 59 sqq.). For kaтà $\boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\eta} \nu \chi \dot{\chi} \rho a \nu, 7$ ('in connexion with the territory'),
 $\pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta$ '̇ $\pi \kappa \epsilon \in \lambda \epsilon \epsilon a$. "O $\sigma \eta \nu, 7$, is probably right: see Stallbaum's note on Plato, Crito 48 A, and cp. Plut. Lycurg. c. 18 , тب̣̂ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \epsilon ́ \rho \omega ́ \tau \eta \mu a ́ ~ \tau \iota ~$

 кảk тоíov П$\eta \lambda о \hat{v} \pi \epsilon \phi$ úp $\eta \tau a \iota$. $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ have $\dot{\pi} \boldsymbol{\pi o ́ \sigma \eta \nu , ~ n o t ~ \pi o ́ \sigma \eta \nu , ~ i n ~}$ 1328 a 18.
8. olovtą $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ oủv к.т.ג. Aristotle has before him Plato, Laws


 460 A , where there may be an allusion to the name of Megalopolis founded in B. c. 369 shortly before the time when many think that the Republic saw the light. See also Rep. 423 A sq. (referred to by Eaton) and Laws 737 D.
11. Tิิv ėvoוкoúvt $\omega \nu$, 'of the inhabitants,' not merely of the citizens, so that according to these authorities a city would be $\mu \in \gamma$ á $\lambda \eta$ which included a large number of slaves, metoeci, and aliens.



 remarks that $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ in $\epsilon i s \delta_{\hat{\epsilon}} \delta \dot{v} v a \mu \nu \nu$ is used in the same sense as ${ }^{\dot{\alpha}} \lambda \lambda \alpha{ }^{\prime}$, and compares Metaph. K. 3. ro6I a 23, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ tov̂ ồ таínv סє є"ठovs, and De An. 1. 5. 409 b 28.
13. каi $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \varsigma$, 'of a State also [as well as of other things]': cp. c. 3. ${ }^{1} 3^{2} 5$ b ${ }_{2} 5$, кaì тoûto.
18. oủ катà к.т.入., 'it is not in respect of any and every multitude that we must do so.' For кuтà тò $\tau v \chi \grave{\partial} \nu \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os cp .7 (5). 3. 1303 a 26 and 6 (4). 4. I291 a II sqq. It is evident from what follows that Aristotle counts $\beta$ ávavoot here among $\delta o \hat{\lambda} \lambda o \iota$, just as he does in 3. 4. 1277 a 37 sqq. Camerarius (Interp. p. 279) has already referred to the story told of Agesilaus by Plutarch in Ages. c. 26. The allies of the Lacedaemonians had contrasted the large number of troops which they contributed to the army of Agesilaus with the small number of the Spartans, and Agesilaus by way of reply ordered all the potters, smiths, carpenters, masons, and other ßávavgoı тєұvîtaı in his army to stand up successively. Nearly every man in the contingent of the allies stood up, but not a single Spartan, and Agesilaus remarked, with a smile, $\dot{\delta} p a ̂ \tau \epsilon,{ }^{\omega} \tilde{a} \nu \delta \delta \rho \epsilon s$, ô $\sigma \omega$
 this story.
ávaүкаîov $\gamma$ à $\boldsymbol{\kappa}$ к.т.入. This would be especially the case in a State like that which Aristotle is constructing-a State in which the citizens are not allowed to practise handicrafts or to till the soil. It would also be the case in a State like that of Plato's Laws ( 848 A ). But even in actual Greek States $\xi \in \in \iota \iota$ were numerous.

Many handicraftsmen were $\bar{\xi}$ évot ( $3 \cdot 5 \cdot 1278$ a 7). Zévot were especially numerous in seaports (4 (7). 6. 13 ${ }^{2} 7$ a II sqq.), but even
 The rapid development of the arts and of commerce in ancient Greece was largely due to the ease with which its chief cities drew metoeci and other aliens from the Greek colonies in Asia and elsewhere and from Asia generally (see as to Sidonian residents in Athens Hicks, Greek Historical Inscriptions, p. 157). Many of these metoeci were skilled craftsmen. Asia and probably Egypt were to some of the arts of ancient Greece what Italy was to those of mediaeval Europe. Italy, indeed, did not supply metoeci to the ruder nations to the same extent. Even at the present day 'in Roumania commerce and industry are in the hands of foreigners, principally Jews, the upper classes being landed proprietors' (Times, March 18, 1897).
19. $\delta$ oúd $\omega \nu$ ápi $\theta \mu$ òv $\pi 0 \lambda \lambda \omega \hat{\omega}$. Here, as in 2. 7. 1266 b io sqq., àpt $\theta$ ós takes the place of $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os. So in Phys. 6. 7. 237 b $33 \tau \bar{\omega}$ $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \tau \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \circ \rho i \omega \nu=\tau \hat{\varphi} \alpha \dot{\alpha} \iota \theta \mu \varphi \hat{\varphi} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \mu \circ \rho i \omega \nu$ (Bon. Ind. 603 a 4 I ).

 is implied in what follows that hoplites are oikeîa $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho t a \tau \eta{ }_{\eta} s$ пóde $\omega$ s
 and 6 (4). 4. 1291 I 24 sqq .), but not $\beta$ ávavoot, who are here contrasted with hoplites, though it is clear (see above on 18) that they often served as hoplites.
 the Egyptian Thebes in Hom. Il. 9. 383 ,
àvépes ${ }^{\text {és }}$
and perhaps also $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \epsilon \pi \pi о \mu \epsilon \nu$ in the story of Agesilaus related above on 18.

 тò $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o \mathrm{u}$.
25. ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{a} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$. . . $\gamma \epsilon$, 'but certainly,' as elsewhere. Kaì roûro, 'this also,' i.e. that not only is a populous State not necessarily a large one, but that a very populous State cannot easily be a wellordered one. And a State which is not well-ordered is only a State in name (3.9.1280 b 5-8).
 in the direction of number': cp. Plut. Lycurg. c. 10, $\delta \iota a \phi \theta$ єipoutas
 Carthage must have been an exception, unless we suppose its citizen-body to have been smaller in Aristotle's day than it afterwards became (see vol. ii. Appendix B). As to the Lacedaemonian State, cp. Isocr. Archid. § 8i, where Archidamus is made to say,
 $\dot{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \omega \nu, \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ к. $\tau_{0} \lambda_{.}$, and as to Athens, which was in the contrary



 Interp. p. 280).
32. $\theta$ eías $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ $\delta \grave{̀}$ к.т. $\lambda .$, 'for surely this' (i. e. the ordering of a great number of things) 'is [beyond the power of man and] is the function of divine power, which is such as to hold together even the vast universe in which we live ; the beautiful, in fact, [which is closely allied with order, ] is commonly found in connexion with a given number and magnitude.' For $\theta$ eia סívapıs Bonitz (Ind. 324 a I) compares the spurious De Mundo, 6. 397 b 19 . Aristotle clearly has before him Xen. Cyrop. 8. 7. 22, ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{a}$ $\theta \epsilon o u ́ s ~ \gamma \epsilon ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ a ̉ \epsilon \grave{~ o ̛ \nu \tau a s ~ k a \grave{~}}$











 4 II b 6 sqq.: cp. Polyb. II. 19. 3. Aristotle probably regards God as holding the universe together passively by being the common object towards which everything strives: see above on 1325 b 28 . That the beautiful is closely allied with order we see


 passages already quoted by Eaton). Vict. compares with the




 ка入оі̀ $\delta$ ' ขü.
34. sıò кai móגıs к.т.ג., 'hence a State also,' as well as other things. For the 'nominativus pendens' $\pi$ ò̀ts, see Bon. Ind. s.v. Anacoluthia, where $7(5) .6$. I 306 b 9 sqq. is referred to among other passages, and see Stallbaum on Plato, Cratylus $403 \mathrm{~A}, \delta \delta \dot{\delta}_{\mathrm{e}}$
 і̀о́дать тои́т凶, and Riddell, Apology of Plato (Digest of Idioms, $\S_{27 \mathrm{I}} \mathrm{b}$ ), who quotes among other instances Theaet. ${ }_{7} 73 \mathrm{D}$ and Rep. $5_{5} 5$ D-E. Cp. also De Gen. An. 4. 1. 765 b 3 r sqq. and De Part. An. 3. 8. 67 I a 12 sqq., and see Vahlen on Poet. 4. 1449 a 19. Bekker and Sus. have $\pi \boldsymbol{o}_{\boldsymbol{\lambda} \iota \nu}$ in place of $\pi$ ó̀ts, but all MSS. except $\Gamma M^{\beta}$ have $\pi \boldsymbol{o}^{\prime} \iota s$, and there can be little doubt that móds is right, for this 'nominativus pendens' is a not uncommon form of anacoluthon.


 supplied. See also note on 1279 b 38 . 'o $\lambda \epsilon \chi \theta$ eis öpos is the standard of not being too large to be well-ordered.
35. ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ Ë $\sigma \tau \iota ~ \tau \iota$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. ., 'but in fact [apart from questions of beauty and good order] there is a due measure of size for a State also, as well as for everything else.' Not only will too large a State fail of being well-ordered and beautiful, but it will fail also to be able to discharge the function of a State and to realize self-completeness in respect of good life, and the same thing may be said of too small a State likewise. Cp. Eth. Nic. 9. 10. ri 7 o b











 note that a State is distinguished by Aristotle from an ö $\rho \gamma{ }^{\circ} \nu o \nu$. It
 being like the individual, only nobler and greater than he (Eth. Nic. r. 1. 1094 b 7 sqq.).



 $\dot{\eta} \tau \rho a \gamma ต \delta i ́ a ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ av́r $\bar{s}$ фúv $\tau \nu)$.
41. Suoîv ataסíolv, cp. Poet. 7. 145I a 2, oîo $\epsilon i ̉ \mu v p i \omega \nu$ otadíav є̈ך $\zeta$ ¢ิov。



 where the view expressed by the Platonic Socrates in Rep. 369 D,

 a number of citizens is not a mó久ıs because a $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota s$ is a koıv $\omega \nu$ ia
 exist in a very large módıs, for magistrates cannot easily exist in it, and a constitution implies the existence of magistracies $(6(4)$. I.
 тіра тро́тог $\nu \epsilon \nu \epsilon ́ \mu \eta \nu \tau a \iota$ ). It seems to be implied that the constitution is the source of 'completeness in respect of good life.' Aristotle's argument here throws some light on his reference to Babylon in 3. 3. 1276 a 27 sqq., where it is implied that Babylon covered too large a space to be one city. He would probably also say that its inhabitants were too numerous to possess a constitution or to be marshalled by a general. When he says that an ëtvos possesses only 'completeness in respect of necessaries,' is he speaking of $\tilde{\epsilon} \theta \nu \eta$ composed of $\pi$ ódets (see note on 1261 a 27 ), as well as of $\epsilon \theta \nu \eta$ composed of villages? As to Aristotle's account of the " $\theta$ vos something has already been said in vol. i. p. 39. We should have been glad if he had told us more on the subject (see note on 1274 b 34 sqq.).

 2. 1324 b 9 sqq.) ; it is bound together not only by internal trade and by united action against external foes, but also by intermarriage and common sacrifices ; it is often ruled by a King, and may even have an Absolute King at its head (3. 14. 1285 b 31 sq.), but it is too large to have a constitution-we must suppose that the word 'constitution' is here used in a sense exclusive of Kingshipapparently because it is too large to be controlled by common magistrates (cp. 3. 9. 1280 a 40 ). We may conjecture that in Aristotle's view the members of an êvos have not that desire to promote the virtue of their fellows which is to him one distinguishing mark of a citizen (3.9. 1280 b I sqq.). An ${ }^{\prime} \theta$ vos is, in fact, rather a $\sigma v \mu \mu a \chi i a$ and something more than a $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \kappa к \grave{\eta}$ коиршvía.
7. $\delta$ เò к.т... Here again, as in 2, the Platonic Socrates is corrected (see above on 2). Cp. c. 8. 1328 b 16 sq. and 2. 2. 1261 b
 note on 1325 b 18). Kará seems to mean 'in connexion with':

 followed by 0 , see above on 1267 a 24 .
 and Susemihl, but it appears to be correct: cp. De Gen. An. 4. 4.




 minimum size, if he is to be a man at all; if he exceeds that minimum and does not exceed the maximum, he is a larger man; if he exceeds the maximum, he ceases to be a man. The same thing, we are told in the passage before us, holds of the mólis.
11. $ั \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ єїто $\mu \epsilon v$, in 1326 a 34 sqq.
14. äpxovtos $\delta$ ' ėmítagıs kai kpívs Ēpyov. Kpíaıs here refers
 next sentence). In the similar passage, 6 (4). 15.1299 a 25 sqq .,


 refer to judicial decisions, for here Aristotle is speaking of $\dot{a} \chi^{a i}$ in
a sense exclusive of tò $\delta$ oraactıóv, of which he treats in another chapter of the Sixth (old Fourth) Book (c. 16).

 àjiav as an instance of ai $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \grave{\nu} \rho \chi o \mu \epsilon \varphi \nu \omega \nu$. Aristotle here follows in




 ${ }_{766}$ E. Dr. Johnson says of the lairds' courts in the Highlands of Scotland (Journey to the Western Islands of Scotland, Works, 8. 320 - - When the chiefs were men of knowledge and virtue, the convenience of a domestic judicature was great. No long journeys were necessary, no artificial delays could be practised ; the character, the alliances, and interests of the litigants were known to the court, and all false pretences were easily detected.' See also
 Aristotle probably refers to Athens, for though in addressing an Athenian audience Hyperides says (Pro Lycophr. col. xii. 5, ed.

 § 172 as too large to be ev̇vívortos (cp. Thuc. 8. 66. 3, already referred to by Eaton). Still even at Athens owing to the publicity of men's life in ancient Greece fellow-citizens knew each other far better than they do in a modern city of the same size: see Haussoullier, Vie Municipale en Attique, p. 179 sq., who however goes too far when he says, 'tout se savait, tous se connaissaient à Athènes.' It is, indeed, difficult to understand how even in a citizen-body of (say) 5,000 , with all the help derivable from frequent festivals, every citizen could be known, either personally or by repute, to his fellows. Yet Aristotle seems to imply that the citizens of a State ought to be acquainted with the character of every member of their body, if not with his person. The experience of the United States fully confirms the view of Plato and Aristotle that where fellow-citizens are not well acquainted with each other's characters, offices will not be well filled. 'In moderately-sized communities men's characters are known, and the presence of a bad man in office brings on his fellow-citizens evils which they are not too numerous to feel individually.... In large cities the results are different because the
circumstances are different' (Bryce, American Commonwealth, Part 3, c. 62). 'City governments begin to be bad when the population begins to exceed 100,000 and includes a large proportion of recent immigrants. They are generally pure in smaller places, that is to say, they are as pure as those of an average English, French, or German city' (ibid. Part 3, c. 67 : vol. ii. p. 52 I, ed. r. See also c. 6I , vol. ii. p. 435). Aristotle would, of course, think a citizen-body even of 100,000 ten times more numerous than it ought to be. As to London, compare a remark made by a member of the County Council of London at its first meeting. 'Provincial corporations could easily proceed to elect aldermen, because in the provincial towns persons knew all about each other, but it was quite different in the metropolis' (Times, Feb. I, 1889).
 at Athens. The register of citizens was kept by the deme: 'l'assemblée du dème est peu fréquentée ; c'est un petit nombre de voix qu'il faut acheter, et quelques drachmes suffisent : ici cinq drachmes par tête, ailleurs peut-être moins encore.' See Haussoullier, Vie Municipale en Attique, p. $3^{2}$ sqq., who refers to


 names got upon the register in this or in other unlawful ways were called $\pi$ па́'́धरраттot. The larger the State was, the less check there would be on the registering authority. The Attic demes of Halimus, Sunium, and Potami, all of them on the coast, were especially credited with a readiness to admit aliens to the register (Hug, Studien aus dem classischen Alterthum, p. $3^{2}$ ). It will be noticed that Aristotle speaks only of aliens and metoeci, not of slaves.
22. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ov toívuv к.т.入. See vol. i. p. 314.
24. Eủrúvortos must apparently mean 'easily within the view of the magistrates and the citizens' (cp. 14 sqq.).
 said that the larger the State is, the better, if only it is evovivontos, and now he goes on to say that the most self-complete territory is the best, and one which is large enough to support its citizens in a life, not temperate only, but temperate and liberal, though

 $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \in \in \kappa \nu \omega \nu$. We more often have the acc. after $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ in phrases of this kind in the Politics.
$\pi \epsilon \rho \mathfrak{i} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ үàp к.т..ג. For $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ in the sense of 'quod attinet ad,' see Vahlen on Poet. 23 . 1459 a 16 , who quotes Rhet. 1. 15. $1375^{\text {b }} 25$,
 סıттoí, and Phys. 7. 4. 249 a 29. With moiav tuvá supply $\delta \in i$ eiva Tì $\chi$ đ́pav. In his preference for a territory as self-complete as




 said of the just (Op. et Dies, 236),

 with which Virgil's lines (Ecl. $4.3^{8}$ sq.) may be compared, Cedet et ipse mari vector, nec nautica pinus Mutabit merces: omnis feret omnia tellus.
Thessaly was famed for the variety of its produce; it was rich in corn and wine and timber, and in pasture for horses cattle and sheep (Bursian, Geographie von Griechenland, I. 47); Cyprus was rich in corn, wine, oil, timber, and copper (Strabo, p. 684). We read of the $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \pi \dot{\alpha} \mu \phi o \rho o s$ of the Tyrrhenians in Diod. 5.40. 3,
 Mir. Auscult. 100. 838 b 22. Isocrates speaks of Egypt in Busir.
 Fragm. 1068) and Laconia (E. Curtius, Peloponnesos, 2. 218) were remarkable for the variety of their produce. All these were fertile regions, but there were countries which were at once mú $\mu \phi$ оро and rugged, and it is a territory of this kind that Plato prefers (Laws 704 D ). Aristotle would hardly follow him in this. He would hardly be satisfied with a territory like the Attic, which comprised much poor land (Plut. Solon, c. 22), though it is called $\pi а \mu \phi$ оюштár ${ }^{\text {b }}$ by Xenophon (De Vect. 1. 3: cp. Plato, Critias 1 Io E, and Antiphanes, Fragm. ' $\mathbf{~} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\omega} v \mu \boldsymbol{}$ : : Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 98). The main reason which leads both Plato and Aristotle to prefer a $\pi \dot{\mu} \mu$ фopos territory is that in a State possessing such a territory importation and exportation are reduced to a minimum, and consequently also the commercial class. States with a barren territory
have often in the history of the world been forced to become commercial in order to exist-e.g. Aegina (above on $125^{8}$ a 34), Phocaea (Justin, 43.3.5), Elea (Strabo, p. 252). As to Chios see note on 1291 b 20. Much of the territory of Corinth was infertile, and this helped to make her a commercial State (Curtius, Peloponnesos, 2. 516). 'It was on a bare rock surrounded by deep sea that the streets of Tyre were piled up to a dizzy height' (Macaulay, Hist. of England, c. 24). As to Venice see H. F. Brown, Venice, P. 25 I . 'Nuremberga, cuius agro nihil magis sterile fieri potest, omnium tamen Germaniae urbium populosissima et opificum multitudine florentissima putatur' (Bodinus, De Republica, p. 518). The word $\pi$ avтoфópos appears to be extremely rare: $\pi a ́ \mu \phi o \rho o s ~ i s$ common enough.
 probably supply, not $\pi a ̂ s ~ \tau \iota s$ ầ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi a \iota \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon \iota \epsilon$, but $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ єîvat as with $\pi \epsilon \rho \hat{\imath}$
 $28-38$, where the same standard is adopted, in correction of


 spirit of that of Aristotle here. Aristotle does not wish the citizens of his 'best State' to live either like the people of Myconus, who were charged with stinginess (Cratin. Inc. Fab. Fragm. 6: Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. I75), or like the Boeotians, of whom the comic poet Eubulus said (Meineke, 3. 222),

## $\kappa \tau i \zeta \epsilon \in$ Bot $\omega \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$


See also vol. i. p. $3^{16}$, note r. For the use here of $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \iota$ кai
 тaútทs. We have $\mu \epsilon i \zeta \omega \nu$ кaì $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \omega \nu$ used in a somewhat similar way




33. $\dot{\sigma} \tau \tau \epsilon \rho \circ v$. This is one of the promises of future investigations which are not fulfilled in the Politics as we have it (see vol. ii. p. xxvii sqq.).
$\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ к \tau \eta \eta \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ каì $\uparrow \eta ̂ s \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ o u ̉ \sigma i ́ a v ~ \epsilon u ̉ \pi o p i a s . ~ K a i ~ i s ~ e x p l a n a t o r y, ~$
 sense $k \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ will be dealt with. K $\tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota s$ has been dealt with from
another point of view in 1．8． 1256 a 1 sqq．Compare what Plato says on the subject in Rep．591 D sq．For $\tau \eta ิ s \pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ oủaiav

 छ́vila ひै $\lambda \eta$ s．
 in what way it should stand to the use made of it＇：cp．Diog．Laert．





 $\pi \omega ิ s . к \iota \nu \epsilon i ̂ ~ к а і ̀ ~ \tau i v a ~ \tau \rho o ́ \pi o v: ~ H i p p o c r . ~ D e ~ C a p i t i s ~ V u l n e r i b u s, ~ v o l . ~ i i i . ~$



 baum＇s note on Plato，Laws 681 D，oũтш тє кaì тaútŋŋ．Aüтív is added to $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu$ to contrast＇the use itself＇with $\tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 constitution itself＇is tacitly contrasted with matters preliminary to the constitution and not falling within it．Vet．Int．wrongly refers
 habere et quo modo ipsam ad usum．＇

36．то入入аì $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к．т．$\lambda$. ．＇for there are many disputes on the subject of this inquiry，arising because of those who，＇etc．For

 óf $\sigma \dot{\nu} \nu$ Biov．Should $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \quad \chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu$ be supplied with $\tilde{\epsilon} \lambda к о \nu \tau a s ? ~ O n ~ t h e ~$ side of $\gamma \lambda \iota \sigma \chi \rho o ́ t \eta s$ were the Pythagoreans（see a fragment of Aristophon in Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr．3．362，and fragments of Alexis，ibid．3．474，483），the Cynics（Diog．Laert．6． 8 sub fin．： 6．25：Diog．Cynicus，Fragm． 273 Mullach），and writers like Ephorus （see above on 1265 a 30 ），to say nothing of the lawgivers of Sparta （Xen．Rep．Lac．2． 5 sq．：Plut．Lycurg．c．17）and Crete（2． 10. 1272 a 22）；while on the side of $\tau \rho \cup \phi{ }^{\prime}$ were Aristippus（Diog．Laert． 2． $68,69,84$ ）and others（vol．i．p． 301 ，and p． 302 ，note 1 ：also p．I99，note I）．

39．тò $\delta$＇єîoos tîs $\chi$ ́pas к．т．入．Wyse，followed by Sus．${ }^{4}$ ，is

 character of the territory,' i.e. its geographical character, as distinguished from the character of the soil, which has been dealt with in 1326 b $26-30$. Cp. Plato, Laws 625 C , $\tau \eta \dot{\nu}$ yà $\tau \hat{\eta} s \chi^{\dot{\omega}} \rho a s$
 and 834 C.
 matters by the opinion also of those who are experienced in questions of generalship [as well as that of those who look especially to the supply of commodities, the subject which has just been before us].' Aristotle may probably have before him the work of Aeneas Tacticus entitled $\Sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \iota$ à $\beta_{\imath} \beta \lambda i a$ or $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$
 mentarius Poliorceticus of Aeneas (see below on 1331 a 16): cp.


 kai סv́roriovs, and c. 16. I6 sqq. Aristotle learns something from generals in 8 (6). 7. I32I a 16 sqq. as well as here.
 Compare what is said of the city in c. Ir. 1330 b 2 sqq. and I33I a 3 sqq. Egypt (see vol. i. p. $3^{16}$, note 2, and Strabo, p. 819) and Persis (Plut. Alex. c. 37) were difficult of access to foes, and Socrates claimed (vol. i. p. 3i6, note 2) that Attica was so, but Laconia is probably especially present to Aristotle's mind, for it was $\delta v \sigma \epsilon \mu \beta 0 \lambda \omega \tau a ́ \tau \eta$ (Xen. Hell. 6. 5. 24 : Eurip. Fragm. 1068 : see Curtius, Peloponnesos, $2.217,3$ II). Boeotia, on the contrary, lay comparatively open to the foe (Plut. Reg. et Imp. Apophth.

 $\chi \in i, p a$ סıà по́ртакоs $\ddot{\epsilon}^{\prime} \chi \omega \sigma \iota$ ), and of Elis we read in Curtius, Peloponnesos, 2. 6, 'No region of the Peloponnese is less protected against attacks from without. A broad river-valley leads, like an open entrance-road, from the interior into the midst of Elis; the mountains at the back of the territory afford little protection, because they are only the lower ranges of higher mountains. The level coast-line offers the easiest of approaches from the North and the South ; the plains and the villages are exposed on all sides to landings from a hostile fleet.' That a country might be at once
hard of entrance to foes and easy of exit for friends we see from

 $\dot{\delta} \delta \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda o v \mu \in ́ v o u s ~ к . \tau . \lambda$. Another characteristic which the territory should possess, but which is not noticed here, is that it should be such as to favour the unity of the State (7 (5). 3 . 1303 b 7 sqq .). X $\rho \dot{\eta}$ тoîs $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$, not $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu^{\mu} \nu \nu \tau o i ̂ s$, is the logical order, but ' $\mu \epsilon \in \nu$ interdum non ei additur vocabulo, in quo vis oppositionis cernitur' (Bon. Ind. 454 a 20 ): see above on 1268 b 12.

 territory should be well within reach for purposes of protection leads on naturally to the question as to the site of the city. This question is here dealt with only so far as the position of the city with reference to the territory and the sea is concerned; other matters come up for consideration in c. II. 1330 a 34 sqq. The city should be placed where it will be readily able to protect the territory and to receive supplies of commodities. For both purposes it must be near the sea, yet it must also be well situated with respect to the territory. Whether Aristotle's opinion was known to Alexander when he founded Alexandria in B. c. 332 , it is impossible to say, but at any rate the site of this city in many respects fulfilled Aristotle's requirements. Cp. Strabo, p. 798, Tîs



 (No doubt Aristotle would not rejoice in the greatness of Alexandria as an emporium or in its close contiguity to the sea.) Some cities had the fault of being at a great distance from their territory (8 (6). 4. 1319 a $3^{2}$ sqq.). In not a few cases part of the territory was cut off from the city by mountains (this was the case with the Thyrean territory of Argos and the Lepreate territory of Elis), or by an arm of the sea (as when island cities held territory on the adjacent mainland). On the other hand, there were cities like Sparta, which were too far from the sea. Sparta is probably especially present to Aristotle's mind in $13^{27}$ a $3^{-27}$. It was evidently in his opinion not situated so well either for the protection of its territory or for the transmission of produce from its territory, as it would have been if it had been nearer to the sea.

Nor was it ( 18 sqq.) easily within reach of rescue by sea or capable of striking a blow by sea, nor could it well receive by sea commodities lacking to it or send away by sea its surplus produce. The cities of Elis and Messene were also too far from the sea.




 $\chi^{\text {© }}$ pas. In Aristotle's view the ideal site for a city was one which placed it in easy communication with both land and sea. Rome, according to Cicero (De Rep. 2. 5. 10), was marked out for empire by a position of this kind, and much the same thing may be said of London. We learn, indeed, from c. ix. 1330a 34 sqq. that a city should be in easy communication, not only with its own territory and with the sea, but also with the mainland on the verge of which it lies. Such was the situation of Athens: cp. Xen. De


 Aristotle evidently prefers the site of Athens to that of Sparta, and indeed to those of most other Greek cities. It is easy to see from $13^{27}$ a $3^{-27}$ that Greek cities at a distance from the sea, and especially those whose communications with the coast were difficult -such cities, for instance, as Tegea and Mantineia-were neither very secure from foes nor very well supplied with commodities, and that cities immediately on the coast-and most Greek colonies were thus situated-tended to become denationalized and disorderly owing to the multitude of aliens which flocked to them, and also to suffer an increase in the number of their citizens not conducive to efficient government. In this matter as in others Aristotle favours a mean; the city should be neither on the sea nor too far from it.
4. $\pi$ ро́s $\tau \in \tau \grave{̀} \nu$ ádartav к.т.ג. For the order of the words cp. c. 11. I331 a 12 sqq. and c. 16. 1335 b 5 sqq. 'Tє . . . $\tau$, ut apud omnes prosarios, apud Aristotelem quoque raro in usum venit' (Eucken, De Partic. Usu, p. 16, who gives as another instance in the Politics c. 10. $13^{29}$ b 2 sq.).


 тоаайтŋ ${ }^{\text {n }}$.

 and Sus. The fact that Athens lay near the coast must have greatly facilitated and cheapened the transport to it of the produce of its territory, and especially the transport of heavy commodities like timber, stone, marble, and metals.
 other industry of the kind that the territory may possess.' Aristotle passes from $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \gamma \nu \nu \rho \mu \hat{\mu} \nu \omega \nu$ кар $\bar{\omega} \omega \hat{\nu}, 7$, to commodities like wood, stone,


 in marble and silver (ibid. r. 4 sq.). For épyaciav, cp. Thuc. 4. 105,




 referred to here held that nearness to the sea was prejudicial to orderly government in two ways-(I) it involved the residence in the city of aliens bred up under other laws and likely to exercise an unfavourable moral influence on the citizens; (2) it involved the existence of a very numerous citizen-body, inasmuch as the numbers of the citizen-body would be swollen by a body of merchants, who, it is taken for granted, would be citizens. (That the word $\pi=\lambda v a \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi i a$ refers to the number of the citizens appears from $\mathrm{I}_{3}{ }^{2} 7$ b $7-9$, where it is explained that in Aristotle's 'best State' there will be no $\pi$ òvavepomia in connexion with the oars-
 contends, on the contrary, that nearness to the sea does not necessarily involve either of these results. The city might be placed at a little distance from the sea and might possess a port on the coast, whose inhabitants might be restrained from free communication with the inhabitants of the city; and this port should be a small port, intended for the supply of the needs of the members of the State, not of those of the world in general. Who were the critics whose views are here controverted? Possibly Plato is referred to, but this is not certain, for though he objects
to nearness to the sea in Laws 704 D sqq. (see Stallbaum on this passage, who refers to Cic. De Rep. 2.3.5 sqq., and cp. Laws 949 E sq. $95^{2} \mathrm{D}$ sqq.) on account of the risk of evil influences from aliens, he does not object to it on the ground of its involving $\pi$ mòvav $\theta \rho \omega \pi i a$. In all probability the views here controverted were those of persons oligarchically inclined. That tòvav日 $\rho \omega \pi i ́ a$ is unfavourable to good government we have already seen (c. 4.1326 a 25 sqq.). Many Greek cities were much exposed to the influence of aliens: Byzantium was overrun with them (Aelian, Var. Hist. 3. 14: cp. Athen. Deipn. $5^{2} 6 \mathrm{e}$ ), and at Agrigentum in its palmy days, if we may trust Diodorus ( 13.84 .4 ), there were 180,000 aliens, while the citizens numbered somewhat more than 20,000 . Haussoullier (Vie Municipale en Attique, p. 189) shows how foreign worships were instituted at the Peiraeus by aliens for their own behoof, and some of these probably spread to the citizens. We know that the seaports of Dundee and Leith were the channels through which the Reformation found its way into Scotland. "" The knowledge of God," says Knox, "did considerably increase within the realm, and this was chiefly effected by merchants and mariners belonging to Dundee and Leith," who imported the reformed doctrines from abroad' (Academy, Feb. 11, 1893). That contact with aliens might have ill results, we see from Cic. De Leg. Agrar. 2. 35. 95, Carthaginienses fraudulenti et mendaces non genere, sed natura loci, quod propter portus suos multis et variis mercatorum et advenarum sermonibus ad studium fallendi studio quaestus vocabantur. Contact with aliens even of a satisfactory type might well affect the fidelity of the citizens of a Greek State to its traditions, and many of the aliens who crowded to Greek seaports were Asiatics of a type the reverse of satisfactory. The people of Epidamnus found that those of their citizens who had much communication with their Illyrian neighbours became demoralized (Plut. Quaest. Graec. 29, yıүvoнévous $\pi$ ouvpoús). We read of the Spartan Callicratidas in

 Machiavelli in his Discourses on the First Decad of Livy (I. 55) ascribes the integrity and piety of the Germans of his day in part to the fact that 'they have never had much commerce with their neighbours, being seldom visited by them and seldom going abroad themselves, but live contented with the food and clothing that are the product of their own country, thereby preventing
all opportunities of evil conversation that might corrupt their manners.' It should be noticed that the argument here reproduced by Aristotle assumes that aliens did not take up their abode in inland cities; this does not, however, seem to have been invariably the case, for we hear of metoeci at Thebes (Diod. 17. II : Lys. Or. 23. 15) and under the name of $\pi$ ápotкo at Thespiae (Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 294. I). Indeed, Aristotle himself speaks in c. 4. 1326 a 18 sqq. as if a body of aliens and metoeci was a necessary appendage to every Greek State.





18. $\mu \hat{e} v$ oûv appears to be answered by $\delta \dot{\epsilon}, 3^{2}$.

 were for one thing less exposed to famine than States which were not ([Xen.] De Rep. Ath. 2. 6). See also Plato, Laws 705 A (quoted in the next note). We can imagine with what anxiety cities at a distance from the sea, for instance those of Arcadia, watched the prospects of the corn-harvest. The worship of Demeter and of Zeus, the giver of rain, would be especially congenial to such localities. They no doubt kept a vigilant eye on their rivers and the catabothra through which they in some cases flowed off to see that no flooding occurred and that they were not interfered with by rival neighbouring States. Greek colonies, on the other hand, were mostly at no great distance from the sea, and their command of necessaries must consequently have been much superior to that of many districts of Greece proper.


 3 sqq. and to c. Ir. 1330 a 34 sqq., but compare on the other hand
 èriveta кai 入ı $\mu$ évas к.т.入., and Plato, Laws 7o5 A (a passage perhaps


 for it draws part of its supplies from the sea and sends part of its
surplus produce away by sea, besides being more easily protected against foes. Aristotle had advised in c. $5 \cdot 1327$ a 3 sqq. that the city should be well placed in relation both to its territory and to the sea. No one had disputed that it should be well placed in relation to its territory, but a doubt had been raised whether it ought to stand in any relation whatever to the sea. Hence what is uppermost in Aristotle's mind is to show that it should not be far from the sea. That it will be well placed in relation to its territory, he takes for granted.
21. каi $\gamma \dot{\text { à }}$ к.т.л. For evidence of this fact, see vol. i. p. 3 17. Compare also Thuc. 5.82 .5 sq. The successful resistance of the seaport Stralsund to the besieging army of Wallenstein illustrates Aristotle's remark. 'The problem of overcoming the resistance of a fortress open to unlimited succours by sea is one of the most difficult in the whole art of war' (S. R. Gardiner, Thirty Years' War, p. 107). The Duke of Wellington preferred Calcutta to Agra as the seat of British Government in India (Lord Stanhope's Conversations with the Duke of Wellington, p. 306). For $\pi \rho$ òs tò fạov
 in place of tovis $\pi 0 \lambda$ enious, which is the reading of $\Gamma \Pi$ ), cp .2 .7 .


23. kai mpòs tò $\beta \lambda$ áyat k.т.入., 'and with a view to injuring assailants, if it should not be possible [to be easily succourable] both by land and by sea, the State will be more in a position to be so by one or the other, if it shares in both.' I do not think with Susemihl (Bericht über Aristoteles, etc., in the Jahresbericht für Altertumswissenschaft, lxxix. 1894, p. 273) that Argyriades is right in bracketing $\pi \rho o ́ s$ before тò $\beta \lambda a ́ \psi a u$. The suppressed nom.
 defended itself in both ways against Xerxes, and Syracuse against Athens. Agrigentum, on the other hand, had no fleet when it was besieged by the Carthaginians (Diod. 13.85 sqq.: Holm, Griech. Gesch. 2. 592). Athens would have had little prospect of success in the Peloponnesian War if she had only been able to strike at her assailants by land. The Lacedaemonian State suffered from not being able to attack its Theban invaders by sea. Compare a saying of Epaminondas (Aristid. Leuctr. I. p. 42 I, 18, quoted by Schäfer,


25. ${ }^{\circ} \sigma \alpha \tau^{?}{ }^{\not a \nu}$ к.т.ג. It seems to be implied that the import and export of commodities was only possible by sea: Athens, however, imported many commodities by land (Xen. De Vect. r. 7, каì кат̀̀


 not comparable in extent to its trade by sea (see Büchsenschütz, Besitz und Erwerb, p. 444 sqq.).
 тvүरávŋ пap’ aùroîs ồva к.т.入. A State may do things for itself which it would demean itself by doing for others (cp. 5 (8). 2. 1337 b 19 sqq. and 3. 4. 1277 b 5 sq.).
 Athens. Isocrates had claimed that in instituting a great mart at the Peiraeus, Athens had done Greece a service (Paneg. § 42 ); Aristotle, however, asserts that Athens had had the increase of her revenue in view. No doubt she derived a large revenue from the Peiraeus (see Xen. De Vect. 3. 12 sq., 4. 40, and [Aristot.] Oecon. 2. I 346 a 5 sqq.), but the existence of a great emporium there also added largely to her influence; we see how bitterly the Megarians felt their exclusion from it (Thuc. 1. 67, 139). Among the chief sources of revenue at Athens were the fiftieth on exports and imports, the duty on sales, and the impost paid by metoeci (Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 350 sqq.) ; the existence of a great emporium at the Peiraeus would largely increase the receipts from these and other sources. The revenue of States which did not possess an emporium must have been much smaller than the revenue of those which did. The revenue of inland States especially must have been limited, and few inland democracies can have been able to provide pay for attendance at meetings of the assembly and dicasteries.
 i. e. greed for revenue, for $\pi \lambda \epsilon \rho \nu \epsilon \xi$ 位 probably does not mean 'gain' here, though it often bears this meaning. Cp. Plato, Tim. 27 C,

 cities of Athens, Corinth, Megara, etc.
33. Ėrívela kaì Xıцévas. 'Etivela are port-towns: cp. Suidas




 єủфvผิs кєí $\epsilon \nu 0 \nu$.
 as neither to occupy the same city [as the buildings of the city] nor to be very far away.' The subject of $\boldsymbol{\nu \epsilon} \mu \epsilon \iota \nu$ appears to be
 *Agrv is used of the central city of the State lying round its central acropolis, in contradistinction to other cities comprised within the territory. For the omission of eival, see above on 1277 a 38 and 1286 b 36. Cyllene, the port of Elis, and Gytheium, the port of Sparta, would be thought by Aristotle to be too far from Elis and Sparta.
 walls and other similar defences' (such as trenches, cp . Xen. Anab. 2. 4. 22).
 i. e. in ports and harbours.
37. єi $\delta \epsilon ́ ~ \tau \iota ~ \beta \lambda \alpha \beta \epsilon \rho o ́ v ~ к . т . \lambda . ~ A r i s t o t l e ~ h a s ~ b e f o r e ~ h i m ~ P l a t o, ~$ Laws $95^{2} \mathrm{D}$ sqq. Compare the plan adopted by the people of Epidamnus of appointing a $\pi \omega \lambda \eta \tau \eta \prime$, through whom alone all purchases from, and sales to, their Illyrian neighbours were to be made (Plut. Quaest. Gr. 29).
41. ßentiotov, thus used, is less common in the Politics than $\beta_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \tau \iota o v$, but we have it in Plato, Gorg. 500 C .
oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ بóvov к.т.入. We read of Dionysius the Elder in Diod. 14. 107. 4 that he required Rhegium to surrender to him its fleet of

 1328 b 7 -10 and $3.15 .1286 \mathrm{~b} \mathrm{27-31} .\mathrm{Sections} \mathrm{of} \mathrm{the} \mathrm{citizen-}$ body were often the originators of $\sigma$ rávts $\left(7(5) \cdot 3^{-4)}\right.$ and might need to be controlled.
 to the amount and magnitude of this force, with respect to that,' etc. For $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta_{\text {ovs }}$ каi $\mu \epsilon \gamma^{\prime}$ धoovs, see above on 1326 b 30 .
4. єi $\mu \dot{v} v$ үàp к.т. ג. That a Greek State could not live a life of hegemony without possessing a fleet, is virtually implied by the view, which dates back as far as the days of the Persian Wars, that a hegemony confined to the land is a 'lame hegemony' (Diod. in:
50). Epaminondas held this view (see above on ${ }_{13}{ }^{2} 7$ a 23 , and also Grote, Hist. of Greece, ro.416-419, and Schäfer, Demosthenes, 1. 104 sq .).
5. тoגıtıkóv, 'spent in relations with other States,' not a solitary life, like that of the States referred to in c. 3.1325 b 23 sqq. Cp.
 a State may have political relations with others without standing to them in a relation of hegemony.
 excessive number of citizens which arises in connexion with the mass of trireme-oarsmen.' So Sus. ' jene Pöbelmenge die aus dem

 the acc. means 'to happen to' in Plato, Protag. 309 B, and in Polyb. х. 16. 7, I. 22. I, and 5. iro. 7, but I do not think that this is what it means here. As to $\pi$ òvav $\theta \rho \omega \pi i a$, see above on $\mathbf{1 3}_{3}{ }^{2}$ a in. The Athenian demos was largely composed of triremeoarsmen (6 (4). 4. 129 I b 23).
11. $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta}$ Өous $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. The connexion of this sentence with that which precedes it would have been clearer if it had run, 'but the oarsmen need not be citizens, for, as a mass of perioeci and cultivators of the territory will be forthcoming, there will necessarily be no lack of sailors also.' Would Aristotle's serfs, who are not to be $\theta$ ouociठ̀ $\epsilon i$ s, make good sailors? His plan of employing serfs as oarsmen had been anticipated not only at Heracleia on the Euxine, but also by Jason

 тooótovs ëXovтas $\pi$ пevécras;). 'Quod idem nostra quoque aetate Veneti factitant, qui ad instruendas classes in agris delectum habere et valentiores agricolas triremibus adscribere consuerunt' (Giph. p. 945). Even at Athens, where a large section of the demos was composed of trireme-oarsmen (see above on 7), metoeci and aliens, and occasionally slaves, were also thus employed (Thuc. r. $143,3.16,8.73$ : Isocr. De Pace, $\S \S 48,79$ ). The oarsmen of the Lacedaemonian fleet were Helots or hired men (Xen. Hell, 7. 1. 12).

 ports and harbours. As to the fleet of the Pontic Heracleia, see Grote, Hist. of Greece, 12.623. 3. Heracleia waged a vigorous
naval war with Leucon，prince of the Cimmerian Bosporus，who reigned from about B．с． $39^{2}$ to $35^{2}$ ．In later days（в．с．280）her ships of war with five and six banks of oars and her one great óstipns helped Ptolemy Ceraunus to defeat the fleet of Antigonus Gonatas（Memnon，ap．Phot．Biblioth．p． 226 b 19 sqq．Bekker ： Droysen，Gesch．des Hellenismus 2．2． $33^{2}$ ）．


 Meisterhans，Grammatik der att．Inschr．，p．34，ed．2）and appears in an Attic inscription prior to в．c． 403 ，but Aristotle probably used the form＇Hpaкえє由́тクs，which is found in an Attic inscription of в．c． 298.

15．$\tau \underset{\omega}{\omega} \mu \in \gamma^{\prime} \theta \epsilon \epsilon$ ，i．e．in respect of the number of its citizens．
16．$\lambda \iota \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega \omega$ is placed next to $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a s$ ，because the harbours were to be outside the city，not，as was often the case，within it．

 $\gamma \in \gamma \rho a \mu \mu \in ́ v a \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ т о и ̆ т \omega \nu . ~}$

19．$\pi \rho о ́ т е \rho о \nu, ~ i n ~ c . ~ 4 . ~ 1326 ~ b ~ 22 ~ s q q . ~ . ~$
21．$\beta \lambda$ é ${ }^{\text {as }}$ к．т．入．A similar contrast is drawn between ai é $\pi \iota \phi a-$ C． 7.
 the preposition（ $\bar{\pi} i-\pi \rho o ́ s)$ finds many parallels in Aristotle＇s way



 5 （8）．6．134 a 33 sq ．， 5 （8）． 7 ． $134 \mathrm{I} \mathrm{b} 3^{8-4 \mathrm{I}}$ ，and 6 （4）． 15 ． 1299 b 16 sq．；and Kühner，Ausführl．gr．Gramm．，ed，2，§ 450.
 sections by nations＇：cp．c． 12 ．I331 a 20，and Plato，Laws 886 A，


 and in particular those in Europe，＇etc．Kai introduces an explana－ tion and limitation of tà év roís $\psi v \chi$ poîs rótoıs ë̈ $\theta \nu \eta$ ，as in I .9 .1257 b
 track of Plato，Rep． 435 E，and of Hippocrates，De Aere，Aquis， Locis，vol．i．p． 547 sqq．Kühn，and esp．p． 553 （as Giph．points out， p．948：see also Eaton）：cp．Androt．Fragm． 36 （Müller，Fr．Hist．

Gr. 1. 375). Aristotle probably held that a connexion exists between coldness of climate and abundance of $\theta$ vuós. He may have traced the connexion thus. Cold hardens the animal frame and makes it dry and earthy, not watery (De Gen. An. 5. 3. 783 a 15 sqq.), and animals in whose blood the earthy element predominates are spirited in character (De Part. An. 2. 4. 650 b 33 sqq.), whereas those whose blood is of a more watery nature have a more subtle intelligence, and, if this wateriness is extreme, are cowardly ( 650 b 18 sqq.). See vol. i. p. 319, note 1 , and De Part. An. 2. 2. 648 a ${ }_{2-11}$. A different explanation may be deduced from passages in the Problems ascribed to Aristotle, which are not, however, one of his authentic works (Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 100: Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 96). Өupós is connected



 14. r6. 9 10 a 38 sqq., makes the flesh close and solid, and so prevents the escape of the internal heat. As to the 'spirit' of the barbarians to whom Aristotle refers, cp. Eth. Eud. 3. 1. 1229 b 28,


 Bраßєéє $\theta a t$ : Seneca, De Ira, i. ir, quid Cimbrorum Teutonorumque tot millia superfusa Alpibus ita sustulit ut tantae cladis notitiam ad suos non nuntius sed fama pertulerit, nisi quod erat illis ira pro virtute, and 2. 15 (referred to by Giph. p. 948), 'ut scias,' inquit, 'iram habere in se generosi aliquid, liberas videbis gentes quae iracundissimae sunt, ut Germanos et Scythas' . . . Deinde omnes istae feritate liberac gentes, leonum luporumque ritu, ut servire non possunt, ita nec imperare. Non enim humani vim ingenii, sed feri et intractabilis habent : nemo autem regere potest, nisi qui et regi. Fere itaque imperia penes eos fuere populos qui mitiore caelo utuntur. As to the meaning of E $\dot{\nu} \rho \dot{\omega} \pi \eta$ here, see vol. i. p. $3^{18}$, note 3. In Hom. Hymn. in Apoll. 250 sq., 290 sq. E $\dot{p} \rho \dot{\rho} \pi \eta$ is distinguished from the Peloponnese and the islands, but not from Hellas.
25. ठьóтєр к.т...., 'hence they continue comparatively free, but devoid of constitutional organization and unable to rule their neighbours.' They are free in comparison with Asiatics (3. 14.

1285 a 2 I). Aristotle can hardly include the Macedonians among the 'nations of Europe,' for they were not unable to rule over others, but does he regard them as Greeks? He is probably thinking of the Scythians, Thracians, and Illyrians among other





 $\$ 67$, where the Scythians and Thracians, as well as the Persians,



 $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \tau \tau \grave{a} \eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \theta \epsilon a$ к.т.ג. Hippocrates, however, in the same treatise

 Would Aristotle say of the Persians (cp. c. 2. 1324 b ir) what he says of the Asiatics here? Modern observers take much the same view of Asiatic character. 'The Asiatic is as clever as the European with his hands and wits, though he lacks initiative and the power of government' (Speech of Sir H. H. Johnston, Times, Nov. 7, 1894). Aristotle's account of the Asiatics was hardly flattering to Alexander as the conqueror of Asia, nor did it lend support to his scheme of fusing Greeks and Asiatics. See on the subject vol. i. p. 319, note 3. Aristotle traces similar contrasts between animals to those which he here traces between the nations




 rulers. Kingship prevailed over most of Asia (Hippocr. De Aere, Aquis, Locis, vol. i. p. 553 Kühn), and in many places of a despotic type (3. 14. 1285 a 16 sqq.).
 of the difference between Greeks and barbarians in De Antid.




 $\pi \epsilon \pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon \hat{\sigma} \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \omega ิ \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$.
 regarded as the centre both of Greece and of the habitable earth,

 $\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \gamma \hat{\eta} s \dot{\partial} \mu \phi a \lambda \dot{\lambda} \nu$ к..т...). Xenophon claims the same position for Athens (De Vect. x.6), and Strabo for Italy (p. 286). Cp. also




 vol. i. p. 32 I , note I , and compare also the exclamation of Agesilaus in Plut. Ages. c. 16, and Isocr. Paneg. § 131. For



 of 'unity of constitution' Aristotle has in his mind is not clear ; he may be thinking of the establishment of a common council of Greece by Philip of Macedon after the battle of Chaeroneia (vol. i. p. $3^{2 \mathrm{I}}$, note I ), or of an union of the free States of Greece, not under the headship of Macedon, but under some Federal bond. The latter kind of union would be more truly an union of Greeks than an union under the headship of Macedon, and it is of an union of Greeks that Aristotle speaks.
 possessed only of $\theta_{\nu \mu}{ }^{s}$ s Aristotle probably counted the Arcadian (Curtius, Peloponnesos, 1. 168) and Aetolian, and possibly also the Boeotian (see above on 1274a $3^{2}$ ), and among those possessed only of stavooua some of the Ionians of Asia Minor.

 that the mildness of the dog to those whom he knows is due to the philosophic element in his nature, and had concluded ( 376 B ),



Eivat ; Aristotle claims, on the contrary, that what Plato ascribes to the philosophic element is really due to $\theta u$ uós ( 38 sqq.), inasmuch as it is $\theta v \mu$ ós that makes men loving. Few ruling races have possessed in perfection the combination of qualities which Aristotle demands in the citizens of his best State. In most perhaps there has been more $\theta v \mu$ ós than $\delta$ oúvoua.
38. ӧтєр үáp к.т.ג., 'for as to what,' etc. The reference is to Plato, Rep. 375 D sqq. Plato is referred to as $\tau \nu \in$ es also in c. 10. $\mathrm{r}_{3} 2^{29} \mathrm{~b}_{4} \mathrm{I}$ sq. and in other passages collected by Zeller, Plato, Eng. Trans., p. 62, note 4 I. Plato's remark that dogs are fierce to those whom they do not know was no doubt suggested by
 $\kappa \omega \sigma$. The connexion of $\theta v \mu$ ós with affectionateness appears also
 $\theta \omega \pi \epsilon \cup \tau \iota \kappa$ á, oiò kíwv. Compare also Top. 2. 7. 113 a 35 (referred to


 द̈тоוто $\mu і ̈ \sigma o s ~ \grave{\rho} \rho \gamma \hat{\eta}$. Camerarius (Interp. p. 289) remarks that Theognis had already connected love and hatred with $\theta v \mu$ ós (Theogn. rogi,



 by Bonitz, Ind. 207 a 46 sqq.

1. $\sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ o \nu ~ \delta \epsilon ́ ~ к . т . \lambda . ~ C p . ~ 5 ~(8) . ~ 4 . ~ 1338 ~ b ~ 42, ~ \sigma \eta \mu \epsilon i ̂ o \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ o u ̉ ~ \mu u к \rho o ̀ ̀ \nu ~ 1328 ~ a . ~$
 finds an indication that $\theta v \mu{ }^{\prime} s$ is the faculty of love in the fact that when it is stirred it is more stirred in relation to those we love than in relation to those who are unknown to us. Is the following fragment of the Medea of Neophron (Fragm. 2), a tragic poet of the time of Euripides or possibly somewhat earlier, based on the passage of Archilochus of which Aristotle quotes a part?














 кароíav, and also Fragm. Trag. Gr. Adespota, 32 I Nauck,

2. Sıò каì'Apxìохоs к.т.ג., 'hence Archilochus for instance ' (see above on 1255 a 36), 'when he complains of his friends, fittingly enough discourses to his spirit [which is closely connected with friends, saying,] "For thy tortures surely were from friends." See Archil. Fragm. 66, 67. For ảmáyхєо, cp. Aristoph. Vesp. 686 Didot, ô $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ́ ~ \mu ' ~ a ̉ \pi a ́ \gamma \chi \epsilon \iota ~(' e x c r u c i a t ') . ~$.
3. каì тò ăpXov Sè к.т. ., i.e. the principle of rule and freedom as well as the capability of affection. Here Aristotle does not dissent from Plato, but agrees with him. He remembers Plato, Rep. 375 B,

 reminiscence of the saying of Heraclitus quoted in $7(5)$. I I. I3 ${ }^{1} 5$ a 30 sq. Compare also Eth. Eud. 3. 1. 1229a 27, ő $\mu \omega s$ ס̊̀ $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$


 ঠvขauévous äp $\chi \epsilon \iota \nu$.
 6 (4). 13. 1297 b 3. See note on 1335 b 5. This takes up
 375 D sqq. Magnanimous men are fierce only to those who act unjustly, and so far from being fiercer to such persons when unknown to them, they will be fiercer to them when they are familiar friends. Plato, however, had himself said in Laws 73 I B,



4. $\pi \alpha \rho^{\prime}$ ois $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$., 'for in quarters in which they conceive there should be a feeling that the benefit conferred in the past is owed back [and ought to be requited], they think that in addition
to the injury done them they are defrauded also of the benefit.' Aristotle mentions in Rhet. 2. 8. 1386 a Ir, among things
 б $\nu \mu \beta \bar{\eta} \nu a$.


 is a fragment of Euripides (Fragm. 965): cp. Democrit. Fragm.





5. тต̂v по入ıтєuo $\mu$ év $\boldsymbol{v}$, ' those who exercise the rights of citizens in the State': cp. 6 (4). II. 1295 b 40 and 7 (5). 9. I310 a 16 , and also 6 (4). 6.1293 a 4 sq.
6. For $\pi$ ór $\eta \nu$, see above on 1326 a 5 .
7. oủ Yà к..т..., ' for we must not aim at the same exactness of detail by means of theoretical inquiries as is realized by means of what is presented to us through sense-perception.' For $\xi_{\eta} \eta \epsilon \epsilon i \nu \delta i \grave{\alpha}$




 $20 \mathrm{~b} 30-39$, and above on 126 rb 29 . The double $\delta \not a$ is awkward, but of this kind of awkwardness there are many instances in the Politics: see 2. 6. 1266 a 2 I Sq., 4 (7). 13. 1332 b I sqq., and 6 (4). 10. 1295 a 9 sqq. The same thing happens with other preposi-tions-with $\pi \rho^{\prime}$ ós in $_{5}$ (8). r. 1 1337 a 18 sqq., and 6 (4). 3.1289 b $3^{8,}$ with $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ in 6 (4). 14. 1297 b 35 sq. and 7 (5). 12. 1315 b 34 , and with $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ in 6 (4). 16. 1300b 29 sq. and 7 (5). 6. 1306b 2.

21 sqq. Aristotle here passes on to the question who are to be C. 8. 'parts of the State.' It is from cc. 8-10 that we learn most of the little that he tells us as to the constitutional and social organization of his 'best State.' He begins by laying down a principle which holds of all things existing by nature, and therefore of the móncs, and indeed of all kovvaviat which issue in 'something one in kind.' In all things that exist by nature the necessary conditions of the existence of the thing are to be distinguished from its parts. Not
all the necessary conditions are parts of the thing, but only those which have something in common. In a $\pi$ ódes the 'something in common' is 'the best attainable life' ( 1328 a 36 ), or in other words eivoauovia, and as this is inseparable from virtue (c. 9. 1329a 22), no class of persons is rightly a part of the State whose occupation precludes its attainment of virtue. Hence cultivators, artisans, day-labourers (c. 9. 1329 a 35 sq.), and traders (c. 9. 1328 b 39) are not to be parts of the State, or in other words are not to be citizens. The classes which will be parts of the State and which will constitute its citizen-body will be tò $\pi 0 \lambda \epsilon \mu \mu$ кóv (c. 9 .

 takes no notice here of a class which he recognizes in $6(4) .4$.
 would no doubt reckon as a part of the State. He is not, however, satisfied with excluding from citizenship the classes which are not inutovpyoì $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ à $\rho \epsilon \tau \bar{\eta} s$ (c. 9. 1329a 20 ); he requires that those who exercise deliberative and judicial functions in his 'best State' shall be over a certain age and yet not too old. In other words he gives supreme authority in his State to men of mature but not too advanced age, who will be presumably possessed of фоóv $\sigma$ ots. Plato in his Republic had reserved the rule of the State for a special class of men highly gifted in intellect and character and prepared for rule by a long-continued philosophical training, but Aristotle does not think that the soldiers of the State would submit to be ruled by a class into which they would not ultimately rise; he also insists rather on the possession of $\phi$ póvnots by his rulers than on a philosophical training, and фpóvŋos is according to him the fruit in fit minds of a ripe age. He follows in fact rather in the track of Plato's Laws than in that of his Bepublic, for Plato had required in the Laws that the holders of the chief offices should be men of mature years. But Plato had not, like Aristotle, arranged that deliberative and judicial functions should be withdrawn from men over a certain age, though he contemplates in Rep. 498 C the retirement of infirm old men from political and military duties. This was, it would seem, a more or less novel suggestion. Its importance was no doubt brought home to Aristotle's mind by his observation of the ill effects of advanced age on the holders of life-offices in the Lacedaemonian State (2. 9. ${ }_{12} 7^{2} \mathrm{~b} 3^{8} \mathrm{sqq}$.), and probably also in many oligarchies. It will be
noticed that in Aristotle's 'best State' the right of deciding questions of peace, war, and alliance would rest, not with the soldiers who would have to fight for the State in case of war, but with the older citizens (contrast the view of the young Archidamus in Isocr. Archid. $\S 3$ sqq.), and that judicial authority, including no doubt the momentous right of inflicting the punishments of death, exile, and confiscation, would also rest with the older citizens. Aristotle evidently thinks that the prospect of succeeding to these great powers after the attainment of a certain age would reconcile the younger citizens to their non-possession of them. He appears to allow the younger citizens to be owners of land (c. 9. 1329a 17 sqq.), and perhaps to hold all but the chief military offices. But they are to have nothing to do with deliberative or judicial functions. In this Aristotle would seem to go too far. The attainment of a certain age has often been made a condition of the tenure of the highest political offices. This was the case at Rome (Willems, Droit Public Romain, p. 242). Even restrictions of this kind would now and then exclude a William the Silent or a William Pitt. But it is one thing to impose a limit of age on the tenure of the highest offices and another to exclude the younger men from the exercise of all deliberative and judicial functions. How is the future statesman to learn his business, if his earlier career is to be exclusively devoted to the profession of arms, and he is not allowed to hold even minor civil offices? Aristotle is evidently too uncompromising, but we must bear in mind two things, if we wish to do him justice-(r) that he desires supreme authority in the State to be in the hands of those who are morally as well as politically ripe for its exercise; he desires Reason to rule in the State as it rules in the well-constituted individual ; (2) that one of his aims is the limitation of war and of indiscriminate conquest, and that his exclusion of the more martially-disposed part of the citizen-body from supreme power in his 'best State' is closely connected with this aim. Nothing had done more to break up and weaken Greece in the fourth century в.c. than the incessant wars which had been waged between the various States-between the Lacedaemonians and the Thebans, the Thebans and the Phocians, the Thessalians of Pherae and the Thessalians of Larissa-and Aristotle may well have thought that the best way to check these wars was to place supreme power in the hands of the older citizens.
 are constituted according to nature, not all those things are parts of the whole organization without which the whole would not exist, it is evident that neither must all those things be taken to be parts of the State which must necessarily be possessed by States, nor must we take as parts of any other union issuing in something one in kind all the things which are essential to such an union.' As this
 would seem to be in the gen. after $\tau \hat{\eta} s \dot{\partial} \lambda \eta s$ vvará $\sigma \epsilon \omega s$, but it is probable that Aristotle began the sentence with the intention of making these words in the gen. after $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho t a$ and inserted $\tau \hat{\eta} s{ }_{\delta}{ }^{\lambda} \eta \eta s$ ovaráoces only by an afterthought. For the thought, cp. 3. 5.

 (with Eaton) Eth. Eud. 1. 2. 1214 b 26, $\hat{\omega}_{\nu}$ ävev yà $\rho$ oủx oiồ $\tau \epsilon$
 drawn a similar distinction: cp. Polit. 287 D, öraı रà $\sigma \mu \mu \kappa \rho \grave{\nu} \nu \hat{\eta}$


 Phaedo 99 B, and see Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 33 I. I (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 360, note I). Tà kaù̀ фúoıv $\sigma v \nu \epsilon \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau a$ are so termed in contradistinction to $\tau \grave{a ̀ ~ a ̀ ~} \pi \grave{o} \tau \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta s$ and to đà àmò $\tau \dot{u} \chi \eta \mathrm{~s}$ and à àò taùropátov (De Part. An. I. I. 640 a 27 -b 4). They are things which have in them a principle of motion and rest, whether that motion takes the form of locomotion, or increase and






 of art have no such principle of motion and rest in them, except accidentally, so far as they are formed of earth or stone or other natural entities). Some of these natural entities are eternal, others are subject to generation and decay (De Part. An. 1. 5. 644 b 22 sqq.) ; some of them are bodies and magnitudes (for instance, the humán body), others possess body and magnitude (for instance, a human being), others are principles within beings possessing
body and magnitude (for instance, the soul): cp. De Caelo, I. I. 268 a 4 sqq., and see Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 384. 3 (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 41 7, note 2). The $\pi{ }^{2} \lambda \iota \iota$, we learn from the passage before us, belongs to the class of natural entities; it must belong to the subdivision of this class which consists of 'things possessing body and magnitude.' As to the words oiv ${ }^{\circ}$

27. oiov єïтє трофウ̀ к.т..ג. Food is the 'common thing' in the case of a ovoritoov, a certain amount of land in the case of the owners of an undivided estate (2. 5. 1263 b 23 sq.).
28. oftav $\delta^{\prime} \eta$ n к.т.ג. That there is nothing in common between the craftsman who uses an instrument and the instrument used, we





 äభuxos סoûdos: cp. Eth. Eud. 7. 9. 1241 b 17-24 and 7. 10. 1242 a II sqq. A slightly different lesson is taught in the passage before us. Here we learn that there is nothing in common between the instrument and the craftsman on the one hand and the product they bring into being on the other, except this, that the instrument and the craftsman act and the product is acted upon. That where one thing acts and another is acted upon there must be something common to the two things, we see from


 סoкei $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ ò $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \pi \dot{a} \sigma \chi \epsilon \iota$. But two things thus related to each other need not have much in common : see vol. i. p. 323 , note I . The usual
 $\mu \nu \rho \phi \eta_{\nu}$ contrasted with $\pi$ rotiv in De Gen. An. 1. 21. 729 b 6 sqq.: cp. also Hist. An. 6. 23.577 a 29 sqq., where $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ v \epsilon \nu \nu=\delta \dot{\epsilon} \chi \in \sigma \theta a u$. In the passage before us the instrument and the craftsman who

 stands to the $\pi \pi^{2}$ ts as a means stands to the end to which it is a means, and thus there is nothing in common between property and the $\pi$ ónts except that the former acts on the róxts and the $\pi \dot{o}$ is
is acted upon. It follows that slaves, who are animate articles of property-and $\chi$ єрvŋ̀тes, including ßúvavao тe $\chi$ virun, are brought under the head of slaves in $3 \cdot 4.1277$ a 37 sqq.-are not parts of the State. ' It was a maxim of ancient jurisprudence,' says Gibbon (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, c. 2), 'that a slave had not any country of his own; he acquired with his liberty an admission into the political society of which his patron was a member.' Contrast



 because there are other кoıvшviau т $\hat{\omega} \nu$ оцоíw besides the mó̀ıs, e.g. trading or religious associations. For the thought, cp. 6 (4). II.
 When Aristotle says in 2. 2. 1261 a 22 , ov̉ $\mu$ óvov $\delta^{\prime}$ ék $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ óvov
 $\pi$ rílcs $^{\text {é } \xi}$ ómoiwv, he is thinking of the distinction between rulers and ruled, so far as he is not using the word $\pi$ onts in a wider sense (see vol. i. p. 40).
37. аüтף סè к.т.ג. Cp. c. 13. 13.32 a 7 sqq.
 Metaph. $\Delta$. 6. Io16 bif, and Phys. 8. 8. 264 b 28. In c. I3. 1332 a 9 we have $\chi \rho \eta \bar{\eta} \sigma \nu$ à $\rho \in \tau \bar{\eta} s$ $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i a \nu$, and the form $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i a$ seems to be the commoner form of the fem. in Aristotle's writings, to judge by the Index Aristotelicus.
 1280 a 33 ). Bávavzor, à yopaiot, and $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o i$ live lives unfavourable to virtue (c. 9. 1328 b 40 sqq .), and so do not share in happiness. There are persons excluded from happiness on account of some defect of nature or fortune ( c . 13. 133 1 b 40 sq .). For $\sigma v \mu \beta a i v e l v$

40. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ор $\dot{\omega}$ к.т.т. For the various accounts given in the Politics of the causes of constitutional diversity, see vol. i. p. 220 sqq. For


 than $\delta i{ }^{\circ} \pi \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, which is added in explanation and to give increased precision to its meaning. Cp. c. 15. 1334 b 5 , $\pi$ ês $\begin{aligned} & \text { è kaì ò̀à tivov }\end{aligned}$ écrat, and 3. 18. 1288 a 39. For toús $\tau \epsilon$ ßious kaì ràs mòıtreias, cp.


 and Meteor. 1. 5.342 b 22, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä̉ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \tau o l o u ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ ф а \sigma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu ~ o ̈ \sigma a ~$ тaxtias пoıeîtal tàs фavta⿱ias.
2. каi пó $\sigma$ к.т.ג., i.e. not only what the parts of the State are, 1328 b . but also how many are the things without which the State cannot exist. For the omission of the article before $\pi$ ót $t s, \mathrm{cp} .3 .5 .1278 \mathrm{a} 2$,

 1329 a 34 sq.

 tं $\quad$ руáias).









8. kaì év aúroîs, 'within their own body also,' as well as in the hands of any mercenaries they may employ or any allies they may possess. Cp. Plato, Laws 697 E , where the misery of a State dependent for its defence on mercenaries is depicted, and Philoch. Fragm. $\mathrm{I}_{32}$ (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. I. 406), $\mu \grave{\eta} \xi \epsilon \nu \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{a} \lambda \lambda^{\prime} a \dot{u} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$



 27-31.
 contradistinction to єỉmopía $\tau \rho \circ \phi \bar{\eta} s$, ỏ $\rho \gamma a ́ \nu \omega \nu$, etc.
11. kaì пpòs полє $\mu$ ккás. Schneider, Bekker${ }^{2}$, and Susemihl add

 repetition of the article, and also of prepositions, Aristotle appears, if I do not mistake, to go further than other prose-writers' (Vahlen, Beiträge zu Aristoteles Poetik, 3.330).
12. каì $\pi \rho \omega ิ т о \nu$, 'and first in excellence,' cp. Isocr. Areop. § 29 ,
 סaupóva are placed first in the list of subjects of official competence given in 8 (6). 8. 1322 b 29 sqq. Cp. also 6 (4). 2. I 289 a 40, $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s}$



13. $\pi$ ávтตv àvaүкаıótaтov. Cp. 8 (6). 8. 1322 a 5 sqq. and 6 (4). 4. 1291 a $22-\mathrm{b} 2$.
15. $\mu$ èv oûv is answered by $\delta \epsilon \in, 24$. Susemihl places in a parenthesis everything between $\dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho, 16$, and $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon \rho \dot{\nu} \tau \omega \nu, 23$, but the parenthesis should stop at $\tau a \dot{r} \eta \eta \nu, 19$, for $\dot{a} \nu \dot{a} \gamma \kappa \eta \quad \tau o i v v \nu, 19$, introduces
 es eitetiv.
17. ©́s фapév. Cp. 2. 2. 1261 b i2 sq.: 3. 1. 1275 b 20 sq.: 7 (5). 3. 1303 а 26.

 $\mathrm{C}-\mathrm{E}$, where there are no soldiers or priests or men of judicial or deliberative skill. For $\tau \eta{ }^{\prime} \nu$ кouvaviav $\tau a u ́ \tau \eta \nu$, 'the society in which this occurs,' see above on 1276 a 14 .
19. katà tàs épyarias taútas ouveotávat móhev, 'should be composed in accordance with these industries': cp. 6 (4). 2. 1289 a


20. Aristotle forgets that herdsmen, fishermen, and hunters are also providers of food.
 Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ and Sus., reads $\delta \iota \kappa a i \omega \nu$ in place of àvaүкаi $\omega \nu$ (cp. 14 sq .), but compare the passages collected in vol. i. p. $3^{2} 3$, note 2 , and also
 đ̀ $\rho \chi \hat{\jmath} s$, and Dion. Hal. Ant. Rom. 7. 40, тoúrous ởv $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \epsilon ́ \chi \epsilon \tau \epsilon$ tòv עoûv,


 comprising fà díkata rà $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \lambda \lambda \grave{\lambda} \lambda o u s$.

 be all of them both cultivators and artisans and the deliberators and judges.' Cp. 6 (4). 4. 1291 b 2 sqq.
 whether for each of the above－mentioned services we are to assume the existence of a separate class．＇For каӨ＇є̈кабтоу є̈рүоע т⿳⺈ע
 $\kappa a \theta^{\prime}$ є́ка́
 does not prevail in every constitution．＇
$\kappa \alpha \theta \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho$ є $\boldsymbol{\imath} \pi о \mu \epsilon \nu$ ，in 24－28．
31．тaûta $\gamma$ à $\rho$ k．т．$\lambda$ ．，＇for these differing arrangements as to participation［besides being different themselves］also make con－ stitutions different．＇This proves their possibility．Cp． 6 （4）． 3 ． 1290 a 3 sqq．

34．аütך $\delta^{\prime}$ є̇бтi к．т．ג．Cp．с．2．I 324 а 23 sqq．
36．єìp $\uparrow$ тal $\pi \rho o ́ t \in \rho o v$ ，in C．1． 1323 b 29 sqq．
 ínóध $\epsilon \sigma$ ，＇that which possesses men absolutely just and not merely just relatively to the principle which may happen to be taken as the groundwork of the State＇：cp． 6 （4）．7． 1293 b 3 sqq．： 7 （5）． 9． 1309 a 36 sqq．：2．9． 1269 a $3^{2}$ sqq．See also Bon．Ind． 797 a 52 sqq．
 had already forbidden the citizens of the State of the Laws，or even their slaves，to practise a handicraft（ 846 D ），and had forbidden the practice of retail trade with a view to money－making to any one except strangers（ $847 \mathrm{D}: 849 \mathrm{C}$ sq．： 920 A ）．Thus he goes farther in this matter than Aristotle．

40．ảyєvvìs $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к．т．入．Cp． 8 （6）．4．I319 a 26 sqq．，and（with
 $\pi \rho o \sigma \delta \in i ̂ a ̉ \rho \epsilon \tau \eta$ ．
$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \rho \epsilon т \eta ̀ \nu ~ u ́ \pi \epsilon \varepsilon a v \tau i ́ o s . ~ P l a t o ~(L a w s ~ 920 ~ B) ~ h a d ~ r e c k o n e d ~ r e t a i l ~$
 $\pi р о т \rho \in ́ \pi \epsilon \iota \nu$ како̀̀s yizvєбӨal．He has in his mind not only the adulteration practised by retailers（Laws $917 \mathrm{E}, 920 \mathrm{C}$ ），but aiso their habit of exacting an excessive profit（Laws $918 \mathrm{D}, 920 \mathrm{C}$ ）．
 є $\dot{\beta} \beta o u \lambda i a$ où $\epsilon \mu i a$ ，and other passages collected in Bon．Ind． 173 a 33 sqq．
 not rare in the Politics：see vol．ii．p．li，note 4 ，and note on 1266 b ．

1829 a. 1. $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ रà $\rho$ к.т.入. For the connexion of leisure with virtue and


 34 sqq. Compare also Eurip. Suppl. 406 Bothe ( 420 Dind.),

रamóvos $\delta^{\circ}$ àv̀̀p $\pi \epsilon ́ \nu \eta s$,


 in an especial sense parts of the State, [so that there is no question to be raised as to their citizenship, such as has been raised as to the citizenship of the ßávavoot and $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o i]$.'
5. Ëтєра каì таûта $\theta$ єтє́ov. Susemihl, following Coray and Bekk. ${ }^{2}$,


 ср. 8, є́ка́тєроע $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ є้ $\rho \gamma \omega \nu$.

фavepòv $\delta$ è kaì тоûto. It has already ( r 328 b 37 ) been said to be фavepóv that the citizens must not be ßávavao or áyopaío or $\gamma \in \omega \rho \gamma$ оi.

 before é $\tau \epsilon$ धिous, see above on I324a 19 .
8. €́тє́pas ảк $\mu \hat{\eta} \mathrm{s}$, 'a different prime.' Warlike activity suits the prime of the body, which, according to Rhet. 2. I4. 1390 b 9 sqq., falls between thirty and thirty-five years of age, whereas deliberative and judicial activity suits the prime of the soul and the intelligence, which Aristotle places at forty-nine (ibid.) or fifty (Pol. 4 (7). 16. 1335 b 32 sqq.). Plato places the prime both of body and of wisdom for men between thirty and fifty-five years of age; he does not seem to have discriminated the two primes, like Aristotle:

9. $\delta \cup v \alpha ́ \mu \epsilon \omega \varsigma=i \sigma \chi$ vos: cp. с. 17. 1336 a 4 and 5 (8). 4. 1339 a 4.
 and Thuc. 3. 27. Cp. also Plut. Aristid. c. 22.



13. $\lambda$ єiтєтаи toivun к.т. $\lambda$., 'the only course left, then, is to assign these constitutional rights' (i.e. those of fighting, judging, and
deliberating) 'to the same men and to both classes' (i.e. both to those who have strength and to those who have wisdom), 'not however simultaneously; but in the natural order of things strength is found in younger men and wisdom in older men; therefore it is adrantageous that distribution should be made to both classes in this way' (i. e. so that fighting should fall to the younger men, and deliberating and judging to the older men), 'and it is just that this should be so, for this division of functions has in it conformity to
 тод七тeià taút $\eta$, see note on 1264 a 38 . There is, however, just a possibility that $\pi$ onıreia, has been repeated from the preceding line by an error on the part of the copyist of the archetype and has taken the place of $\lambda_{\text {etrovprian }}$ or $\tau$ á $\xi v$ or some such word: cp. 3. 6 .
 line, has taken the place of $\beta$ on $\theta$ eias in $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}}$ and Vat. Pal. Vict.
 (Ind. 6 I 2 b 47 sq .) 'hanc partem reipublicae administrandae.' Sus.
 (Mr. Welldon follows him in the former change but not in the
 constitution') the subject of àmootoóvat. But perhaps no change in



 3. 17. 1287 b 37 sqq . and that of kaì סíkauov aùò kaגєiv in 1. 9 . 1256 b 40 . Welldon, however, may possibly be right in reading र̀íxatóv ératv in place of סíkatov eivau (see critical note). In assigning strength to younger men and wisdom to older, Aristotle perhaps has before him Hom. Il. 13. 727-734, 19. 216-219, and 3. 108 sqq.: cp. also Eurip. Fragm. 293 and 511, and Aeschin. c. Timarch. cc. 24,139 . Wisdom was often ascribed not to $\pi \rho \in \sigma$ vítepol, but to old men (e. g. by Pindar, Fragm. 182, cp. Plut. An Seni sit gerenda Respublica, c. 10, and Plato, Laws 653 A: by Sophocles, Fragm. 240, contrast Eurip. Fragm. 25 : and by Euripides, Fragm. 622), but Aristotle ascribes it to $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta$ úrépot. What exact age Aristotle designates by this word, it is difficult to say. In c. 16. 1335 b 29 (see note) those over fifty or even fifiyfive years of age are referred to: on the other hand, in $8(6) \cdot 7$.

oi véo. As the prime of the intelligence is placed by him at fortynine or fifty (see above on 8), perhaps this is the age intended. Alcibiades was probably about thirty-five when he became the advocate of the Syracusan expedition. The saying of Eupolis in
 Meineke, Hist. Crit. Com. Gr. p. 128), was famous. Aristophanes makes the Athenian Demos say of the young men (Eq. I382 Didot: cp. Isocr. Areop. § 45),


In the Polity or moderate Democracy which existed at Syracuse before the Athenian attack, the younger men were excluded from office by law (Thuc. 6. 38. 5). We read in [Heraclid. Pont.]

 ordo magistratuum at Rome. Alcibiades, on the other hand, contends in Thuc. 6. 18. 6 that deliberation is most likely to be successful when it is carried on by old and young men together : compare the arguments put in the mouth of the young Archidamus by Isocrates (Archid. § 3 sqq.).

 1328 b 20 sqq.) to тò єủxopov ( 1328 b 22 ), and in 1329 a 27 sqq. to oi ífecis. חєрì toútous corresponds to тoút $\omega \nu, 25$ (Bon. Ind. 579 b 43 sqq.). By roúrovs Aristotle means soldiers, judges, and deliberators (cp. c. ro. $\mathrm{r}_{3} 29$ b $3^{6}$ sqq.). I add civat with Bekk., Sus., and $^{\text {in }}$ others, though its omission may possibly be defensible, cp. c. ıо. 1330a 25 , where however there is an civau close at hand, and Rhet.
 $\mu \epsilon \gamma а \lambda о \pi \rho \epsilon \pi \bar{\eta}, \pi \epsilon \rho i \epsilon \rho \gamma o \nu$, and see Vahlen on Poet. c. 24. 1459 b 7. Eijropia must be possessed by the citizens, for otherwise they will not be at leisure to attend to politics.


 implied in the saying of Protagoras in Plato, Protag. 326 E, roúrou
 Contrast the description of the xpmuatıoтйs in Plato, Gorg. 452 C as


тои̂тo $\delta$ è к.т...., 'but this' (i.e. the fact that ßávavoor and generally
those who are not producers of virtue ought not to be citizens) 'is manifest from the principle which forms the basis of our State, for happiness must be forthcoming in it in close alliance with virtue, and we should pronounce a State happy, looking not to a part of it, but to all its citizens, [so that all the citizens must be virtuous, whence it follows that $\beta$ ávavaroo and their likes must not be citizens].' In requiring that all the citizens shall be happy, Aristotle here goes beyond 2. 5. 1264 b 17 sqq ., and in requiring that they shall all be




25. фavepòv סè к.т...., 'and this also is evident that the landed properties should belong to these' (i.e. to the soldiers, judges, and deliberators), 'if, as is the case,' etc. The landed properties might have been given to the cultivators (to whom Plato had given them in the Republic, 2. 5. 1264 a $3^{2}$ sqq.), if it were not necessary that they should be slaves or barbarian serfs.
 purchase of a priesthood in Dittenberger, Syll. Inscr. Gr. No. 369,
 Haussoullier's note quoted by Dittenberger, Syll. Inscr. Gr. No. 323 , note 5, and also No. 358, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ' $\epsilon \in \epsilon \in i v a t ~ k a[\tau a ́ \rho] ~ X \epsilon \sigma \theta a t ~ \epsilon i s ~ т o ̀ ~ ' H \rho a i ̂[o v] ~$ $\xi_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \varphi \omega \iota \mu \eta \delta \varepsilon \nu i$, and [Demosth.] c. Neaer. c. 73 .
 worshipped by citizens, but we have ranged all the active citizens either in the hoplite or in the deliberative class (Aristotle here appears to merge the judicial in the deliberative class: cp. 1328 b 26 , тoùs $\beta$ ovitevopévous kaì oıkásovtas, and 1329 a 3 sq.), so that we must assign the priesthoods to those of the citizens who are past the age for work. Citizens who are past work are still $\pi \omega$ s $\pi$ ohitau (3. I. 1275 a 14 sqq.). Aristotle thinks it fitting that the easy and recreative work of paying honour to the gods should fall, not, as was often the case in Greece, to those whose strength was unimpaired, but to those who had become infirm through age (cp. 5 (8). 7. 1 342 b 20 sqq., where easy harmonies are recommended to oi
 498 C sqq.) that in old age, when strength declines and miliary and political work is over, men who are to be happy should reserve themselves exclusively for philosophy. See also on this subject
vol. i. p. $3^{29}$ sq. At Sparta men of advanced years were allowed to discharge important public functions (2.9. 1270 b 38 sqq.), and this Aristotle does not approve. He does not intend to withdraw from the $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \epsilon i s, ~ a ̈ p \chi o \nu \tau \epsilon s$, or $\pi \rho v \tau a ́ v \epsilon \iota s$ the public sacrifices connected with the common hearth of the State which it was their function to offer (8 (6). 8. 1322 b 26 sqq.). These were not priestly sacrifices, and it is of priests alone that Aristotle is speaking in the passage before us. 'Aváravaıs is rather 'relaxation' than 'repose': cp. 5 (8). 5. 1339 b 5 sqq . For the connexion of relaxation with the worship of the gods, cp. Eth. Nic. 8. II. ir60 a 24, тıцàs àmové$\mu 0 \nu \tau \epsilon s$ тoís $\theta \epsilon o i ̂ s ~ к a i ̀ ~ a v i t o i ̂ s ~ a ̉ v a \pi a v ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s ~ \pi o p i \zeta o \nu \tau \epsilon s ~ \mu \epsilon \theta^{\prime} \eta \dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \eta \bar{s}$, and Plato, Rep. $3^{64}$ E (where Stallbaum compares Hdt. 8. 99, ėv Өvoinбi $\tau \epsilon$
 803 D sq.
34. $ิ$ ติท $\mu$ èv toívuv ... $1329 \mathrm{~b} \mathrm{35}, \zeta \eta \tau \tau i ̂ v$. I incline to regard this passage as an interpolation and as not being from the pen of
 spoken in vol. i. Appendix E, and if we reject this passage, as we should probably do, it is difficult to retain the recapitulation, 34 , $\tilde{\omega} \nu$ $\mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ тoívvע . . 39, кaтà $\mu$ '́pos. For this recapitulation cannot have been immediately followed by the second recapitulation 1329 b 36 , ö̃ı $\mu \epsilon \grave{\nu}$ oủv. . . 39, $\chi^{\dot{\omega} \rho a \nu \text {, and to expunge (with Sus.) this second }}$ recapitulation is not advisable, for then the mention of $\tau \hat{\eta} s \delta_{t a \nu} \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\hat{\eta} s}$ in 39 becomes extremely abrupt, inasmuch as the reference to the territory which prepares the way for it in the text as it stands will
 appears still more clearly to have been interpolated. It may have been originally an annotation written by some member of the Peripatetic School on the margin of his copy of the Politics, and may have crept from the margin into the text. It is apparently intended to excuse and account for the absence of a special investigation of the question whether the fighting class should be distinct from the cultivating class. Thus we are told at its close ( 1329 b 33 sqq.) that it is useless to waste time in investigating what is well settled, and that one should investigate only what has been overlooked. It should be noticed that it says nothing of the existence in India both of castes and of a distinction between the fighting and cultivating classes, though Megasthenes, not very long after the time when the Politics was written, testified to this (ap.

$\delta_{\text {utp }}$ jि $\theta a u$ к.т....), but it would be rash to conclude that, if the passage is an interpolation, its author wrote before the publication of Megasthenes' work. That it stood where jt stands in the Politics in the days of the authority followed by Stobaeus in his account (Ecl. 2. 6. 17) of the Political Theory of the Peripatetics is likely, for he says of the distribution of functions between the young, the elders,

 refers, however inaccurately, to the views expressed in this part of c. 10. The late Prof. Chandler and Bojesen, indeed, contented themselves with rejecting only a part of the passage 1329 a $40 \ldots$
 $\Sigma \epsilon \sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \rho \iota o s$, and the latter 1329 b 5 , ápxaia ... ${ }^{2} 5, \Sigma \in \sigma \dot{\omega} \sigma \tau \rho \iota o s$. The part they reject is certainly the most evidently spurious part, but much suspicion also attaches to the part which they retain, 1329 b ${ }_{25}-35$ (see vol. i. Appendix E), and on the whole I incline to reject the entire passage 1329 a 40-b 35 , together with the recapitulation which precedes it, 1329 a 34-39.
 whole class of labourers are a necessary appurtenance of the State' (literally, 'a thing necessary to belong to States'): compare for


 imáp $\neq \epsilon \nu$, and see Stallbaum on Plato, Laws 643 C, öra àvaүкaia $\pi \rho о \mu є \mu а ө \eta \kappa$ éval.



 18. Kaà̀ $\mu$ '́pos, Vict. 'per vices,' i.e. in such a way that the one succeeds the other.
40. "Eoukє $\delta \grave{e}$ к.т.ג. As has been pointed out in vol. i. C. 10. Appendix E, Greek writers are always glad to claim the authority of antiquity in support of their suggestions. Reference has already there been made to Demosth. in Lept. c. 89 : compare also Lucian,


 Isocrates says (De Antid. § 82) that the most ancient laws were
thought the best. For roîs $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a s ~ ф i \lambda о \sigma \circ \phi о \hat{\sigma} \iota \nu \mathrm{cp} .3$. 1.


 were also divided катà vvббítıa and катà фратрias каì фu入ás (2.5. 1264 a 6 sqq.).
 distribution of the population into $\gamma^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \eta$ (Hdt. 2. 164, where, however, the $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o i$ are not mentioned as one of the $\gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \eta$ : contrast Diod. I. 73 sq., where the classes enumerated are priests, kings, warriors, herdsmen, cultivators, and artisans). Herodotus dwells
 Egypt than on the prohibition of agriculture (2. 165, каi тоúт $\omega \nu$
 Isocrates (Busir. § 18) and Plutarch (Lycurg. c. 4 sub fin.), but Plato in Tim. 24 B refers to the separation of the warrior class in Egypt from the herdsmen, hunters, and cultivators. The names of Sesostris and Minos are mentioned in the passage before us to show the antiquity of this institution in Egypt and Crete. The separation of the warriors from those who practise other arts is ascribed by Isocrates (Busir. § I 5 sqq.) not to Sesostris, but to Busiris ; 'legislation respecting the warrior class,' however, is ascribed by Diodorus (I. 94.4) to Sesoosis (Sesostris), whom he calls the third lawgiver of Egypt, and Dicaearchus (Fragm. 7 : Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 2. 235) credits him with a law making all arts hereditary. The passage before us evidently implies that the distinction between warriors and cultivators survived in Egypt even in the writer's day, i.e. that the cultivators did not serve as soldiers, nor the soldiers as cultivators.
5. «̀pxaía $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. With the object of proving that political institutions and laws are of early date (cp. 3 I sqq.), the writer instances another institution, that of the syssitia. Compare the similar transition from the subject of the distinction of warriors and cultivators to that of syssitia in 2. 10. 127 I b 41 sqq.
6. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \hat{\jmath} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ K \rho \eta ́ \tau \eta \nu, ~ s c . ~ \sigma v \sigma \sigma i \tau i a, ~ i n ~ a p p o s i t i o n ~ t o ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ \sigma v \sigma \sigma \iota \tau i \omega \nu ~}$ ŋ̀ $\tau a ́ \xi ı s$.
 from the fact that in Italy syssitia were as old as the introduction of the names 'Italy' and 'Italians' and the conversion of the Italians from nomads into cultivators.

8．\＄aoì yàp к．т．ג．Antiochus of Syracuse is probably referred to， for the facts here related are derived from him ：cp．Antioch．Fragm． 3 （Müller，Fr．Hist．Gr．y．181），＂＇Avrioxos 冗atvoфáveos тáde $\sigma v v e ́ \gamma \rho a \psi e$










 Compare also Virgil，Aen．r． 532 sq．The origin of syssitia is here traced to the territory in which the Epizephyrian Locri was situated， and not to Crete，in much the same way in which the Locrian Onomacritus was made out by some authorities（2．12．1274a ${ }_{25}$ sqq．）to have been the spiritual progenitor of a number of great lawgivers．

11．àkтク́v，＇peninsula＇：cp．Dio Chrys．Or．6．198 R，$\pi \epsilon \rho$ Іє́ $\in \sigma \theta a i$


＇Ita入iav toüvo


12．éevò̀s k．t．ג．The peninsula is apparently reckoned from its point，so that the territory lying between the point and the two gulfs is said to be within them，and the territory lying beyond the two gulfs，looking from the point，is implied to be outside them．

тoû＾a $\mu \eta \tau<\kappa 0 \hat{u}$ ．Antiochus called this gulf，the modern gulf of S．Eufemia，by the name Nanntivos or Namtrivos，a name the origin of which is uncertain；how it comes to be called $\Lambda a \mu \eta \tau \iota k$ ós in the passage before us，which is based on Antiochus，is not clear．The name $\Lambda a \mu \eta \tau \kappa{ }^{\prime} \delta_{s}$ is derived from that of a city called Lametini， probably situated on the shore of the gulf of S．Eufemia and near the stream which still bears the name of Lamato（the ancient Lamêtus）．See Dict．of Greek and Roman Geography，art． Lametini and art．Napetinus Sinus．
 other［only］half a day＇s journey．＇For the omission of＇only＇see
note on 1282 a $3^{6}$. The near approach of the two gulfs to each other is mentioned in justification of the description of Italy as lying 'within' them. They were 160 stadia, or about eighteen miles, apart (see above on 8), hence a day's journey is calculated here at thirty-six miles.
14. тoûtov $\delta$ रे к.т.ג. Italus is probably regarded as the first lawgiver of the Oenotrians, and if this is so, the introduction of legislation among them is connected with the change from a pastoral to an agricultural life : see Mommsen, Hist. of Rome, Eng. Trans.,


 Metam. 5. 34I,

Prima Ceres unco glebas dimovit aratro,
Prima dedit fruges alimentaque mitia terris,
Prima dedit leges.
Janus takes the place of Italus in Plut. Quaest. Rom. c. 22, $\hat{\eta}$

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \beta a \lambda \epsilon$ каі̀ $\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \kappa \dot{o} \sigma \mu \eta \sigma \epsilon$; Compare the language of Strabo as to

 Syssitia (oíros, 'corn') are probably conceived as connected with agriculture. For rov̂roy ò̀̀ rò̀ 'Itàóv Eucken (De Partic. Usu, p. 39) compares I. 6.1255 a 7 , tov̂ro ờ tò oíkatov. $\Delta \eta^{\prime}$ introduces in both passages a statement about the person or thing which has been described in what precedes. We expect $\theta$ eival rather than

16. Sı̀ к.т.入. On the resemblance of this passage to 2 , 10 . 127I b 30 sqq., see vol. i. p. 575 , note 2 . The continued existence of the institution and of certain of the laws of Italus among some of his descendants is apparently mentioned in confirmation of the statement that he introduced the syssitia and was the author of other laws also.
18. फ़ैkouv $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т.д. It would seem that the whole region from the Lametic Gulf to Tyrrhenia (i.e. Latium Campania and Lucania) is here conceived as inhabited by Opici surnamed Ausones. That Aristotle included Latium in Opica we see from Fragm. 567.1571 a 24 sq. Campania, according to Antiochus of Syracuse, was inhabited by 'Opici, who were also called Ausones' (Fragm. 8:

Müller，Fr．Hist．Gr．1．183）．But we do not find that Lucania is elsewhere said to be inhabited by Opici surnamed Ausones，or indeed by Opici of any kind．Herodotus regards Elea，which was in the region ultimately known as Lucania，as in Oenotria，not in Opica（r．167）．

20．тò $\delta$ è mpòs tì̀＇lamuyíav k．t．入．Cp．Antioch．ap．Strab．




tòv＇lóviov，sc．кó入 $\pi o \nu, \mathrm{cp} .6$（4）．4．1290 b ix，and see Liddell and Scott．

23．ó Sè Xwpıopòs к．т．入．The Egyptians，according to Plut． Lycurg．c．4，claimed that Lycurgus visited Egypt and borrowed there the separation of the warriors from the other classes which he introduced at Sparta，and Isocrates in his Busiris（§ 17 sq．）traces this and other Lacedaemonian institutions to Egypt：cp．Pherecr． ${ }^{*}$ Aypıot，Fragm． 5 （Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr．2．${ }^{2} 57$ ），where Lycurgus is connected with Egypt．Aristotle，however，in 2．ro． 127 I b 22 sqq．，like the Lacedaemonians themselves（see above on 127 I b 22），traces the laws of Lycurgus to Crete．
 Fragm． 7 （Müller，Fr．Hist．Gr．2．235），Sesostris was king of Egypt immediately after Orus，the son of Osiris and Isis，and lived 2936 years before the first Olympiad．Herodotus，however， would seem to place Sesostris much later．Camerarius remarks （Interp．p．298），＇quod quidem nunc ait autor，regnum Sesostris longe superare annis regnum Minois，cum narratione Herodoti non videtur congruere．Hic enim＇（2．II2 sqq．）＇Proteum regem Aegypti facit tertium a Sesostri，cuius regnum inciderit in tempus belli Troiani．Et in exercitu Graecorum illius belli fuit secundum Homerum＇（Odyss．19．I78 sqq．）＇Idomeneus et ipse tertius a Minoe，ut paene aequales ita reperiantur Sesostris et Minos；hoc modo，Sesostris，Pheron，Proteus，et Minos，Deucalion，Idomeneus．＇

25．$\sigma \chi \in \delta o ̀ \nu \nu$ н̇̀v oûv к．т．$\lambda$ ．The sense is－＇So then，just as we have seen that syssitia were invented first in Italy and afterwards in Crete，and the division of the population into different classes first in Egypt and afterwards in Crete，we may take it that all other discoveries have been made over and over again an indefinite number of times－for discovery comes easily to men，need reveal－
ing discoveries of a necessary kind, and others following in due course-and this holds of political institutions as fully as of anything else ; but that all political institutions are ancient, [which is what concerns us now,] is proved by the example of Egypt.' The view that everything has been invented over and over again is quite Aristotelian: cp. Metaph. 4. 8. 1074 b 10, катà tò єixòs


 339 b 27 sqq. This view may have been suggested by the fact that the inventions which were ascribed in Greece to Palamedes, Orpheus, and others were ascribed in Egypt to far earlier inventors, so that it was natural to suppose that in the interval between the Egyptian inventors and Palamedes and the rest the arts invented by the former had been lost. It is likely enough that arts have been lost and rediscovered. A writer in the Times of Sept. 27 , 1886, remarks of some 'glazed bricks' of the time of Rameses II from Tel-el-Jahûdî, now in the British Museum, 'Historians of Italian art speak of the "discovery" of Luca della Robbia; here is the faïnce decoration in the highest state of excellence more than
 1264 a I sqq. Aristotle believed that the human race had existed from everlasting (see note on 1269 a 5). For the contrast of rà
 p. 298) compares Top. 3. 2. 118 а 6, каì $\tau \grave{\alpha} \dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \epsilon \rho \iota o v \sigma i a s ~ \tau \omega ̄ \nu$


 бкєvá乌ŋтai $\tau \iota s$ т $\hat{\nu} \nu \kappa a \lambda \omega ิ \nu$ : cp. also 6 (4). 4. 1291 a 2 sqq. For
 Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 2. 729),

 and Leutsch and Schneidewin, 2. 203, $\pi о \lambda \lambda \bar{\omega} \nu$ ó $\lambda \iota \mu$ òs $\gamma і \nu \epsilon \tau a \iota$ ठıठáqкадоs.
That necessary things are discovered first had already been implied by Democritus (see vol. i. p. $35^{6}$, note r ).
31. öть $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ та́vта ápxaîa к.т.入. The argument is-'we might expect the Egyptians, who are thought to be the most ancient race in the world, to have come into existence before laws and
constitutions were invented, in which case we should find them lacking these still, but the fact is quite otherwise ; hence laws and institutions must be of very ancient origin.' Thus the statement with which the passage commences as to the antiquity of the distinction between the fighting and cultivating classes is fully borne out. In the reference to the Egyptians it is evidently assumed with much naïveté that as a race is when it first comes into being, so it will remain. Bernays (Theophrastos über Frömmigkeit, p. 169) and Susemihl would insert à $\epsilon$ after тєтvxŋ́кaлt, but in my opinion without necessity. We are familiar with the belief that the Egyptian race was the most ancient in the world from the well-known story in Hdt. 2. 2. There was a general agreement as to the fact, though some claimed priority for the Phrygians (ibid.) or the Scythians (Justin, 2. 1. 5 sqq.) and Aristotle himself for the Magi (Diog. Laert. r. 8), but there was much disagreement as to the cause. For one theory, see Hippys of Rhegium, Fragm. I (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 2. 13), Diod. I. io. I, and Justin, 2. 1. 5 sqq. Aristotle's own theory may be gathered from Meteor. 1. 14. $35^{2}$ b 20 sqq. The priests of Sais in the Timaeus of Plato ( 22 C sqq.) assign a different cause.
33. $\delta$ เò $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ к.т...., 'hence we should make use of what has been adequately said [without spending time on its further investigation], and attempt to investigate [only] what has been left untouched': cp. c. 1. 1323 a 21 sqq.: Eth. Nic. 10. ro. 118 i b 12 sqq. : Isocr.

 and Lamb. in taking ikayês with тoîs єip $\eta \mu^{\prime}$ vors, and not (as do Sus. and Welldon) with $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a t$ : cp. Eth. Nic. r. 3. 1096 a 3, iкavês $\gamma$ à $\rho$

 these passages and to the very similar passage c. I. 1323 a 21 sqq., I incline on the whole to retain the reading of $\Gamma \Pi$ єipnuevors, and not (with Lamb., Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, and Sus.) to substitute eíp $\eta \mu$ évoes for it, though c. II. I331 a 16 might be quoted in favour of this reading. It is true also that the antithesis to $\pi a \rho a \lambda \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \mu \mu \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu a$ is often $\varepsilon_{\dot{v} \rho \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu a}$ (e.g. in Soph. El. 33. 184 b 6 sqq. and Demosth. De Symmor. c. 23 : cp. Pol. 4 (7). 11. $133^{1}$ a 15 sqq.), but this is not always the case, as we see from Isocr. Hel. § 67 , $\pi$ oג̀̀ $\delta \dot{\delta \epsilon} \pi \lambda \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega$ tà $\pi a \rho a \lambda \epsilon-$
 on 1329 b 13 and 1282 a 36.
 cp. 6 (4). 13. 1297 a 29, $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ тои̂ $̈ \pi \lambda a$ кєкт $\eta \sigma \theta a t$, and see critical note on 1267 b 33. As to the distinction here implied between the hoplites and those who share in the constitution, see vol. i. p. 324 and note 1 on that page.
37. єi้рךтац тро́тєроv, in c. 9. 1329 а 17 sqq.
38. aủtêv étépous, 'distinct from them': cp. c. 12. 1331 b I
 $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ à $\pi \grave{o} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai $\sigma \chi \rho \hat{\omega} \nu$.
40. tivas kai moíous. The answer to tivas (given in 1330 a 25 sqq.) is 'slaves or non-Greek serfs,' and to $\pi$ oious (ibid.) is ' not of one race nor spirited in character.'
41. $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\tau} \boldsymbol{v}$. Aristotle afterwards deals with the site of the city.
$\phi \alpha \mu \epsilon v$, in 2. 5. 1263 a 37 sqq. That no citizen should want for food, is implied in 1263 a 21 sqq. : see above on 1263 a 24.
1330 a. 1. For the reference here to Plato as $\tau \iota v \in{ }^{\prime}$, see above on 1327 b 38. Lycurgus (In Leocr. cc. 92 and $13^{2}$ ) carries this use of $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon \in s$ so far as to say that $\tau \iota \nu \epsilon \in s$ wrote this or that passage of verse which he quotes (Richards).
 qualifies кoเv $\nu$, 'common in friendly fashion,' 'common as the goods of friends are common': cp. 2. 5. 1263 a 29, $\delta \imath^{\prime} \alpha \rho \epsilon \tau \eta \nu \nu \delta^{\prime}$



 and see above on 1259 b II. Sus. and Welldon adopt Congreve's conjecture of $\gamma \iota \nu 0 \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta$ for $\gamma \iota \nu 0 \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu$ (Sus. adding $\gamma i \nu \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ after.子 $(\nu \circ \mu \epsilon \in \nu \eta)$, but, as it seems to me, not rightly.
2. oüт $\boldsymbol{\tau}^{3}$ ảmopєiv к.т.入. As to the importance of this, see Isocr. Areop. $\S \$ 53,83$, and Plato, Laws 735 E.
 all agree that they are an useful thing to belong to well-constituted States.' For the construction, compare c. 9. 1329 a 35 sqq. Aristotle passes on to the subject of common meals, because, like the friendly community of property which he has just recommended, they are a means of securing the citizens against a want of food. It was also necessary to settle the question of their existence before proceeding to the division of the territory, inasmuch as a portion of the territory is to be set apart for their support. Aristotle
nowhere fulfils, in what we possess of the Politics, the promise which he makes in 4 , so that we can only guess why he approved of the institution. He probably valued it as a means of regulating habits of life and of enforcing the 'temperate and liberal' standard which he commends (c. $5 \cdot 1326 \mathrm{~b} 30 \mathrm{sqq}$.) as a means of making an approach to community of property (2.5. 1263 b 40 sqq.), and also as a means of developing a high spirit and mutual confidence in his citizens and securing their acquaintance with each other ( 7 (5). If. 1313 a 4 I sqq.). See vol. i. p. 333 sqq. For an account of the purpose for which, according to Plato, the institution was originally introduced, see Laws 780 B sq.
5. $\delta \in \grave{\imath} \delta \bar{\epsilon}$ k.т. $\lambda$. All the citizens ought to share in the common meals, and not, as at Sparta, that portion only of them which could afford to pay a contribution. See 2. 9. 1271 a 26 sqq . and 2. 10 . 1272 a 12 sqq . Aristotle appears here to contemplate the existence of änopor in his 'best State.' Tò ovveteтay $\mu_{\text {évov, ' 'the assessed sum' }}$ (Liddell and Scott).
7. каi $\delta \iota o к \kappa i v \tau \grave{\nu} \nu \alpha ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ oikiav, 'and to manage the rest of the housekeeping.' For $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ oikiav, cp. c. 17. 1336 a 40 sq . and



9. àvayкaîo toívu k.т.入. As Aristotle's principle seems to be that expenses which fall on all the citizens should be provided for by public land set apart for the purpose, we might have expected him to have gone farther in this direction, and (e. g.) to have set apart public land to defray the expenses of the public education which the citizens are to receive (5 (8). 1. 1337 a 21 sqq.). As to the public land in Greek States, see Büchsenschütz, Besitz und Erwerb, p. 63 sq. Aristotle does not, like Hippodamus (2. 8. ${ }^{1267}$ b 33 sqq.), divide the territory of his State into three partssacred, public, and private-but only into two, public and private. He devotes a part of the public land to expenses connected with the gods, i. e. to the provision of sacrifices, repairs of temples, and perhaps also liturgies connected with festivals.





 are assigned to the peasants of a Russian commune, as described by M. Leroy-Beaulieu in Revue des Deux Mondes, Nov. 15,1876 , 'Chaque paysan reçoit une parcelle d'autant de sortes de terrain qu'il y a de qualités de terre dans la commune.' 'Quand les terres seraient tous de même qualité . . . l'inégale distance du village leur donne encore pour le paysan une inégale valeur.') Aristotle, however, does not approve (2.6. 1265 b 24 sqq.) Plato's further suggestion (Laws 745 E ) of two houses: see above on 1265 b 25 . But would not the cultivation of two lots of land at a distance from each other be almost as troublesome as living in two houses? The reason for the arrangement which Aristotle follows Plato in adopting is obvious enough. Land near the city was probably as a rule far more valuable in ancient Greece than land at a distance from it. It was land in this situation that rich men were most likely to buy up (8 (6). 4. 1319 a 8 sqq.). Cp. Xen.



 foundation of the colony of Thurii oi $\pi \rho \circ \ddot{\pi} \pi a ́ \rho \chi o v \tau \epsilon s$ इvßapíтaı . . . $\tau \eta \nu \nu$

 would not only be better able than others to take an active part in politics and be nearer to the conveniences and the handicraftsmen of the city, but would also command a better market for their produce, and would be less exposed to attack in case of invasion. Frontier-landowners, on the contrary, were the first to suffer in that event. Thus the Lacedaemonian owners of frontier-land suffered so much from the Messenians in Eira during the Second Messenian War that civil trouble resulted (Paus. 4. 18. I: see note on 1306 b 37). Compare the case of the citizens of Corinth who owned the fertile and extensive frontier-plain between Corinth and Sicyon. This plain ' was rendered uncultivable during 393 and 392 в.c.' by the Corinthian War, and though its owners withdrew their servants and cattle to Peiraeum, their loss 'was still so great that two successive seasons of it were quite enough to inspire them with a strong aversion to the war' (Grote, Hist. of Greece, 9. 455). As to the Acharnians, see Thuc. 2. 21, and the notes of Mr. Congreve and Prof. Jowett on the passage before us. The frontier-landowners
of ancient Grecce，unlike those of the English and Scotch Border and of the Welsh Marches of England in the middle ages，seem to have feared more from the loss of their own goods than they hoped from raids on those of the foe．

16．For tò đैбov kai tò Síkaıov cp． 8 （6）．3．13 18 b I sqq．
 about the sufferings of the Lacedaemonian frontier－owners in the Second Messenian War comes from the Eivopia of Tyrtaeus（7（5）． 7． 1306 b 37 sqq ．），and it is just possible that $\sigma v \mu \mu \epsilon \tau \in \in \in \epsilon \nu$ ßovi $\bar{\eta} s \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ о́ $\mu \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \nu$ тол $\hat{\mu} \mu \nu \nu$ was a line in that poem．The Lacedaemonian State may well have been one of those in which the law referred to existed．For the absence of $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ before $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho \dot{s} s$ aùvò̀s $\pi o \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \mu \omega \nu, \mathrm{cp}$ ．


22．$\delta \iota \grave{\alpha}$ tò ísıov，＇on account of their private interest＇：cp．3．13．
 $\delta \rho \omega \bar{\sigma} \nu$ ．For the thought，cp．3．9．1280 a 14 sqq．and 3． 16. 1287 b 2 sq．
 to slaves in the State described in the Laws（ 806 D sq．）．Пєрiotoь differ from slaves in being only half－enslaved（see above on 1269 a 34）．Thus the Mariandynian $\pi \epsilon \rho i o t o o$ of the Pontic Heracleia could not be sold for export beyond the limits of the State（Strabo，p．542）， nor could the Helots（Strabo，p． $3^{65}$ ）．

єi $\delta \in \hat{i}$ кat єủ̉グr．For the omission of cival，see above on 1329 a 17 and 1277 a 38．It omission is facilitated by the nearness of סoúdous eival．
 neither of men all of one kin nor of men spirited in character．＇ The gen．appears to be partitive，as in 7 （5）．7．1306 b 28．Polybius



 Aristotle to mean the same thing by ó óópu入os as Polybius does in this passage，he would be opposed to the employment of slaves belonging to one and the same great stock（Libyan，Celtic，Italian， or the like），even though they belonged to different ${ }^{\prime} \epsilon \nu \eta$ ，but this is not the sense in which the word is used in 7 （5）． 3.1303 a 25 sqq．， and Aristotle probably means $\dot{\delta} \mu \sigma \epsilon \theta \nu \dot{\prime} s$ by $\dot{\delta} \mu \dot{\prime} \phi \nu \lambda o s$ ．In the corre－ sponding passage in Oecon．1．5．1344 b 18 in fact—каì $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ктâб $\theta a \iota$
 is used, not $\dot{\text { óóq}} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ os. Plato had already said in Laws 777 C , $\delta$ v́o

 дá̀ı $\sigma \tau a$, and Aristotle follows in his track. His especial object is to avoid the errors committed by the Lacedaemonian State in its organization of slavery. The Helots were serfs ( $\pi$ epiouoot, not slaves, and Hellenic serfs into the bargain, both ópó申vגo and Av probably had slaves whom he would regard as too nearly akin to each other and too spirited to be submissive. The fugitive slaves who under the name of Bruttians (Bpétrot )did much to ruin some of the Greek colonies in South Italy (Diod. 16. 15 ) were apparently an instance in point. Attic slaves, on the contrary, came from a variety of sources, Lydia, Phrygia, Paphlagonia, Syria, and the Euxine (Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. I 7o). Dionysius the Elder wished his mercenaries to be collected
 approve of a body of slaves wholly composed of negroes, and the experience of the island of St . Domingo in modern times bears out his view. 'It is always a wise arrangement to have different tribes in a caravan, for in the event of a strike, and there are always strikes, there is less chance of concerted action ' (Prof. Drummond, Tropical Africa, p. 90). Some went so far as to advise the actual promotion of discord among slaves (Menand. Inc. Fab. Fragm. 30, in Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 242 and 5. colxxii, and Plut. Cato Maior, c. 21 , quoted by Meineke), but Aristotle says nothing about this. We notice that he imposes no limit on the number of the slaves in his 'best State,' though we might have expected him to do so.
28. ठєútepoy $\delta$ è к.т.д. Non-Greek serfs, unlike the Helots. Aristotle probably has in his mind the Mariandynian serfs of the Pontic Heracleia (see above on 1269a 34). Serfs of this type would have the drawback of being almost inevitably $\dot{\text { ócóquдо. }}$
30. тоútшv סѐ к.т.入. Here again Aristotle departs from the Lacedaemonian practice. The Helots employed on private estates did not belong to the owners of those estates (Strabo, p. 365,
 tois Eit $\lambda \omega$ atas): the owners could not free the Helots employed on their estates or sell them beyond the limits of the State (Strabo, ibid.).

31．riva סè к．т．入．Plato had gone on to deal with this subject in the passage of the Laws（ 777 C sqq．）which Aristotle has before him here．The difficulty of the question is recognized in 2.9 ． 1269 b 7 sqq ．The promised solution is nowhere given in the Politics as we have it，but we have many suggestions on the subject in Oecon．I． 5 ．

32．каi סıóть к．т．入．Dıóтє is here＇why．＇This promise also remains unfulfilled in the Politics as we have it，but cp．Oecon．r．



 кai ó xpóvos $\dot{\varrho} \iota \sigma \mu$ évos．Xenophon had already said in Oecon．5．16，

 by $\pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ rois doúdous both public and private slaves．But it is possible that，as the slave often purchased his freedom from his master，emancipation was most within the reach of the slaves who stood highest in their master＇s service，or who had learnt some lucrative handicraft．
 already been answered by $\tau$ oùs $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma o \nu \tau a s, 1330$ a 25 ，but here
 $3^{-c .6 .1327}$ a 40.

36．aủtท̂s $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ т $\pi$ òs aútウ̀v k．т．$\lambda$ ．Various attempts have been made to interpret this passage as it stands．Göttling，Stahr，Busse （De praesidiis Aristotelis Politica emendandi，p．I 7 sqq．），and Broughton，in his edition of Pol．$x, 3$ ，and $4(7)$ ，take civa to be

 （Polit． 300 C ），and the like，and translate these words＇so far as concerns the position of the city in relation to itself，＇but the objec－ tion to this view is that no instance is produced of the use of eiva in this sense in combination with a similar collection of words． Eival，when thus used，commonly goes with one word，or two or three，of a simple and closely connected kind．Prof．Jowett，on the other hand（Politics 2．273），thinks that＇the order of the words
 （I．p．519）objects that，if we take the passage thus，we require $\tau 0 \hat{v}$

eival．The difficulty of interpreting the passage as it stands being so great，it is not surprising that emendations of the text have been suggested．Coray and Bekk．${ }^{2}$ bracket tivat，while Bonitz（Ind． 375 b 8）places a query after кaratuरxáveiv．For Susemihl＇s view see his note in Sus．${ }^{4}$ Richards suggests that $\kappa a \tau^{\prime}$ ej ${ }^{\prime} \dot{\eta} \nu$ should be read in place of karavuरđáveıv，translating＇but we should pray that the position of the city in relation to itself may be the best possible，＇etc．If，however，$\kappa a \tau^{`} \epsilon \dot{u} \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ was the original reading，we should expect it to be corrupted into karavuхeiv rather than кaratuy－ $\chi^{\alpha} \dot{v} \in \boldsymbol{\omega}$, and perhaps also to stand nearer in the sentence to eivat than it does．In defence of karatuरávecl it may be pointed out that katarvx $\mathrm{\epsilon iv}$ is used in the same sense（＇votis potiri＇）in Demosth．
 Lac．Ages． 59.213 A and De Gen．Socr．c． 9.580 B．I am myself inclined to suggest that some words may be wanting in the text． The rendering of Vet．Int．is＇ipsius autem ad se ipsam si ad votum oportet adipisci positionem，quattuor utique respicientes．＇ Sus．thinks that he here renders a gloss，Busse（De praesidiis，etc．， p．18）that he fills up a lacuna in his Greek text by borrowing words from c． $5 \cdot 1327$ a 3 sq．It is，however，possible that the text ${ }^{\circ}$ of $\Gamma$ differed here from that of the MSS．known to us，and that some words have really dropped out in our MSS．of which the rendering of Vet．Int．preserves a trace．The text，in fact，may

 things seem to be health，adaptation to the needs of political life， adaptation to those of war，and beauty（кó $\boldsymbol{\mu} \mu \mathrm{os}$ ， 1330 b 3 I ），though Aristotle in his haste omits to mention the last．Less attention seems generally to have been paid by the founders of cities in ancient Greece to the first two points than to the rest ：cp．Strabo， p．${ }^{235}$ ，t⿳⿵人一⿲丶丶㇒⿻甲一
 Myscellus，however，the founder of Crotona，had looked to health rather than to wealth（Strabo，p．269），and in later days Hippocrates in his treatise De Aere，Aquis，Locis had paid great attention to the question what site and aspect are most favourable to the health of a city．Plato also had taken health into consideration（Laws 778 E）．For $\pi \rho o ̀ s$ rétтapa óń，cp．Pindar，Pyth．9．90，

$$
\text { Aiरiva } \tau \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho
$$


$\Delta \dot{\eta}$ thus used strengthens (Holden, Index to the Oeconomicus of Xenophon s.v.).
 lates, 'primum ad valetudinem, ut rem necessariam' (and so Lamb.); Vict. 'primum quidem, ut necesse est, ad corporis sanitatem.' But perhaps it is better (with Richards) to supply of with
 roûro. A thịng may deserve to be looked to first either on account of its excellence (cp.c. 8. 1328 b Ir sq. and 6 (4). ri. 1296 b 5 sq.) or on account of its indispensability (cp. 8 (6). 8. 1322 a 29 sq.), and Aristotle is careful to explain that health is to be looked to first




 the most excellent thing in the world (Plato, Gorg. 45 I E sq.: Anaxandrides, Ө $\eta$ бavpós, Fragm. i, in Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 169 , a line of which,
may be in Aristotle's memory here: Rhet. 2. 21. I394 b I3 sq. : Lucian, Pro Lapsu inter Salutandum, c. 5 sqq.: Eth. Eud. i. i. 1214 a 1 sqq.).
 which it is found out of its proper place, see above on $13^{2} 5$ a 19 and 1259 a $\mathbf{1} 3$. Hó̀sts is omitted as a word which will be readily supplied: for other cases of its omission, see above on 1266 bI . Hippocrates, as Stahr and others have pointed out, had already pronounced in favour of an Eastern aspect for cities in De Aere, Aquis, Locis, vol. i. p. $53^{\circ}$ Kühn, ókóral $\mu \hat{\iota} \nu$ ( $\left.\tau \hat{\omega} \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega \nu\right) \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~$

 Compare Columella, De Re Rustica, 1. 5. 5, optime autem salubribus locis ad orientem vel meridiem . . . villa convertitur. The climate of Patras, the ancient Patrae, is thought unhealthy for strangers, because the mountains which rise above it close at hand screen it from the East winds (Curtius, Peloponnesos, I. 440). Cities whose site slopes towards the East are exposed to the wind $\dot{\boldsymbol{a}} \pi \eta \lambda \boldsymbol{\omega} \dot{\omega} \boldsymbol{T} \eta \mathrm{s}$



עórous é $\begin{aligned} & \text { eipet }) \text {, a wind which is in a mean between hot and cold }\end{aligned}$ winds (Probl. 26. 55.946 b 24 sq.), and health results when things hot and cold are in due proportion to each other (Anal. Post. I. I3. 78 b 18 sqq .). The East wind is described as ' warm ' in Probl. 26. 31. 943 b 24, and as 'comparatively warm' in Meteor. 2. 6. $3^{64}$ a $19 \mathrm{sqq}$. See also vol. i. p. 337, note 4.
40. Seútepov סè katà Bopéav, 'and in the second place those which are sheltered from the North wind.' Here Aristotle differs from Hippocrates, who appears to regard cities facing North and sheltered from the South as more favourably situated for health than cities facing South and sheltered from the North (De Aere, Aquis, Locis, vol. i. pp. 525-9 Kühn). For кađà ßopéav, cp. karáßoppos, Oecon. I. 6. 1345 a 33. We expect ai karà $\beta$ ßopéav, but
 íytetvois $\chi \rho \bar{\jmath} \sigma \theta a t$ would have been more regular. See vol. i. p. 337, note 5. Some places suffered much from the North wind, e.g. Ismarus in Thrace: cp. Eustath. on Dionys. Perieg. 27, p. 90 Bernhardy (quoted by Ellis, Commentary on Catullus, p. 384),

 to the North wind, though, as it happened, the North wind was gentle there (Theophrast. Fragm. 5. c. 32 Wimmer). Plato had given the plain around the city in the island of Atlantis a Southern aspect sheltered from the North wind (Critias 118 A).
 c. 5.1326 b 30 sqq. The sentence would have been more regu-

 $3^{8}$, but as a long parenthesis has intervened (ait $\tau, 3^{8-\mu a \lambda \lambda o \nu \text {, }}$



 does not explain what sort of site would be well adapted for political activity, but he would perhaps regard as such a site which, while fairly level and favourable to easy communication, had within it a spot suitable for the common life of the elder citizens who are to rule the State, and somewhat withdrawn from the turmoil of buying and selling, such a spot as he sketches in c. 12 . $133^{1}$ a 24 sqq.
2. $\pi \rho$ òs $\mu \grave{\text { èv }}$ oủv k.т. $\lambda$. Mề oủv is answered by $\delta \epsilon ́, 8$. Similar 1330 b. advice is given as to the territory in c. 5.1326 b 40 , $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ ( $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$
 be (I) 'hard of approach' (סvorapóvoסos), if it lay, like Sparta, behind mountains penetrable at only a few easily-guarded points (Xen. Hell. 6.5.24). Compare the description of Thalamae in

 $\chi \omega ́ \rho a \nu \tau i \grave{\nu} \pi \epsilon \in \rho \iota \xi$ aủ $\tau o v ̂ ~ \sigma \tau \epsilon \nu \eta ̀ \nu ~ \epsilon i v a \iota ~ k a i ̀ ~ \delta v \sigma \epsilon ́ \mu ß o \lambda o \nu ~ \tau o ́ ~ \tau \epsilon ~ \chi \omega \rho i ́ o \nu ~ a ̉ \pi \rho a \gamma-~$

 థ ф роирà каӨєєбті́кєє. A lake or a river or cliffs would answer the same purpose as a mountain: see as to the site of Oeniadae Thuc. 2. 102.3, as to the acropolis of Sicyon (the site to which the city was removed by Demetrius Poliorcetes) Diod. 20. 102. 4, and as to the site of Psophis Polyb. 4. 70. 7 sqq. A city would be (2) 'hard to beleaguer' ( $\delta v \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho i \lambda \eta \pi \tau o s$ ), if the ground about it was made difficult by chasms or unfordable rivers or marshes. Pella was surrounded by marshes (Liv. 44. 46, sita est in tumulo vergente in occidentem hibernum: cingunt paludes inexsuperabilis altitudinis aestate et hieme, quas restagnantes faciunt lacus). Looking to the advances that the art of siege-warfare had made ( 33 I a I sq.), a city's best chance of safety in Aristotle's days probably lay in the difficulty of approaching or beleaguering it.
 should, if possible, be forthcoming a native supply.' Oikeiov, in opposition to $\dot{\boldsymbol{j}} \mu \beta$ piots, 6 : rain-water is not 'native,' but comes from the clouds. Compare the contrast of ${ }^{\circ} \mu \beta \rho \iota o \nu$ and $\gamma \eta \gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\epsilon} s \tilde{v} \delta \omega \rho$ in Plut. De Facie in Orbe Lunae, c. 25.939 C, and also the contrast of oiкєià and ${ }^{\prime} \xi \xi \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \kappa a i ̀ ~ \pi \rho a ́ \xi \epsilon \iota s$ in c. 3.1325 b 29 sq. Na $\mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ is added to explain and limit $\dot{\delta} \delta a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, which, if it stood by itself, would include ${ }^{\circ} \mu \beta \rho \iota a$ v̈ $\delta a \tau a$. The term vá $\mu a r a ~ c o m p r i s e s ~ b o t h ~ s p r i n g ~ a n d ~$ river water: cp. Plut. Quaest. Nat. 2. 912 A, тà $\pi \eta \gamma a i ̂ a ~ к a i ̀ ~ \pi o \tau a ́ \mu ı a ~$ у́дата. Aristotle may possibly have in his memory here some lines of Pindar of which Quintilian has preserved a trace: see Pindar, Fragm. ${ }_{2} 5^{8}$ Bergk (Quintil. 10. I. IO9), non enim 'pluvias,' ut ait Pindarus, 'aquas colligit,' sed vivo gurgite exundat (Cicero), where Bergk remarks, 'Pindarus ovváyєьv vóoara ö $\mu \beta$ рıa dixisse videtur,' but is not 'vivo gurgite exundat' also probably a translation from Pindar? Many Greek cities were famous for
their springs. Corinth was so, and especially for its spring

 Peirene, Curtius, Peloponnesos, 2. 529, 592); Pherae was famous for its spring Hypereia (Pindar, Pyth. 4. 125 : Strabo, p. 439); Cyrene was built round the inexhaustible 'spring of Apollo,' and Hermione also had an inexhaustible spring (Paus.2.35.3). Compare with Aristotle's recommendations as to water-supply those of Columella, De Re Rustica, r. 5. I sqq. We see from the passage before us that a city was all the stronger from a military point of view if its water-supply was good and safe from interference in the event of a siege. Athens was ill-supplied with water (see next note), and her weakness in this respect must have been keenly felt when the country-population was cooped up in the city during the Peloponnesian War.
5. єi $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. ., 'but if a supply of this nature is not forthcoming, a way has been discovered to obtain water by constructing,' etc. For єũpqrat, cp. 133 I a 15 sqq., and for тоиิтó $\gamma \in \mathrm{c} .7$. 1327 b 21 . Toùтó $\gamma^{\epsilon}$ єข̃pךтає means that we need not begin an investigation as to that, inasmuch as the problem has been already solved. ' $\mathrm{O} \mu \beta$ piots is placed before $\tilde{v} \delta a \sigma \iota \nu$ because it is meant to be emphatic. Hippocrates has a good opinion of rain-water (De Aere, Aquis,

 (De Re Rustica, r. 5. 2). Aristotle perhaps intends this hint for Athens. 'There were three or four springs at Athens, but one only, that of Callirrhoe, was drinkable' (Merivale, Hist. of the Romans under the Empire, c. 66, vol. viii. p. 217 , note). See also below on 1330 b 25 . Cisterns for storing rain-water existed in many Greek cities-at Alexandria (Stuart Poole, Cities of Egypt, p. 18r), Cnidus (Dict. of Greek and Roman Geography, art. Cnidus), and Termessus (Davis, Anatolica, p. 231). They existed also in the insular part of Tyre (Maspero, Hist. Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient, p. 192) and at Jerusalem (Tac. Hist. 5. 12). ' The sky is the only source from which fresh water is obtained in the smaller towns of Dalmatia, and especially on the islands, where there are neither springs nor streams' (T. G. Jackson, Dalmatia, 1. 241). Aristotle does not refer to the possibility of bringing water into the city from a distance, but aqueducts existed in his day both at Samos (Hdt. 3. 60) and at Athens (Athenaeum,

No. 3355, p. 223 ). He would probably, however, feel that aqueducts lay at the mercy of an invading foe.

 aủtòv ó 入óyos, тoùtó $\epsilon \in \tau \tau เ \nu$.
 Bon. Ind. 245 b 25 sqq ., where among other passages c. I. I 323 b I ,

 neuter in reference to a fem. substantive, cp. 8 (6). 2. 1317 b i, and see Bon. Ind. 484 a 59 sqq., where Metaph. Z. IO. 1035 b
 quoted.
 facing a healthy quarter' (cp. Plato, Rep. 40i C).
 ข̃ $\delta a \sigma \iota \nu$ íyıє $\nu 0 i$ is $\chi \rho \eta \bar{\eta} \theta a \iota$, but Schneider rightly compares c. I3. I331 b

 $\sigma \kappa \epsilon \iota \nu$ : cp. also 7 (5). 8. 1308 a 7-10, and 7 (5). II. I3 I4 a 33 sqq. As to the fact, cp. De Gen. An. 4. 2. 767 a 28, סıaф'́ $\rho \in \iota$ ס̀̀






 573 b 32 sqq.).

каì тои́тои к.т. $\lambda$. With $\epsilon^{\prime \prime} \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ supply $\delta \epsilon i \neq \imath$ from 8.
11. ois $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. For ois $\pi \lambda$ єiotoıs $\chi \rho \dot{\omega} \mu \epsilon \theta a$, see Vahlen on Poet. 16. 1454 b 20. For the thought cp. Hippocr. De Natura Hominis




 àvat $\nu \epsilon \in \neq \mu \epsilon \nu$. As to water, cp. Hippocr. De Aere, Aquis, Locis, vol. i. p. $53^{2}$ Kühn (a passage which Aristotle seems to have before him), $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau o \nu ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \rho o s ~ \xi \nu \mu \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \tau a \iota ~(v ̃ \delta \omega \rho) ~ \epsilon ’ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ i ́ \gamma \iota \epsilon i ̀ \eta \nu$. VOL. III.

D d

As to air, cp. Philyll. Inc. Fab. Fragm. I (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 864),

Aristotle does not say anything about the importance to health of other kinds of food than water. The Egyptians believed that all maladies arose from food (Hdt. 2. 77: Diod. 1. 82). See on this subject De Part. An. 3. 12. 673 b 25 5-28.
13. $\mathfrak{\eta}$ ठè к.т.入., 'and water and air possess this kind of nature,' i.e. are of such a nature as to be largely and frequently used by us (so Vict. 'talem naturam habere ut crebro cogamur ad illa
 $\pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu a \tau o s ~ \delta \dot{v} \nu a \mu s$ is little more than a periphrasis for $\tau \grave{a}$ víoava кaì $\tau \grave{~} \pi \nu \in \hat{\nu} \mu a$ : see Bon. Ind. 206 b 38 , 'sed etiam ea res cui aliqua facultas inest סv́vauıs nominatur, ut interdum $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu \iota s$ prope ad paraphrasin videri possit delitescere, cf. фúots' in such phrases as ŋ̀ тô̂ үá̀akтos фúrıs, Pol. 1. 8. 1256 b 14 : Bonitz refers among many other passages to Meteor. 1. 2. 339 a 22, $\check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \pi a ̂ \sigma a \nu ~ a u ̉ r u v ̂ ~$
 traceable in Plato: see Ast, Lex. Platon. s.v. סivvauts sub fin.
 vaцát $\omega \nu$, 'if all the springs are not equally good, and there is not an unlimited supply of wholesome springs.' חávтa, sc. тà vá $\mu a \tau a$.
 on 1257 b 12 . The arrangement recommended by Aristotle had probably already been adopted by some Greek cities when he


 been adopted in more than one city of modern Europe ; for instance, at Nice (Times, Nov. r, 1883).
 the тómos $\tau \hat{\eta} s \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ from the point of view of salubrity ( 9 ), and now he turns to consider the question of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \nu \mu \nu o \grave{\imath}$ тómo九. T $\omega \bar{\omega} \dot{\epsilon} \rho \nu \mu \nu \omega ิ \nu$ follows, instead of preceding, то́т $\omega \nu$ for the sake of emphasis. Cp.

 'infant children' as being the most helpless.

provided the city which he founds in the Laws with an acropolis


 $\pi \lambda e i o u s$, that Aristotle's ideal city is to have more strong places than one, and that its chief strong place (c. 12. 133 1 a 24 sqq.) is not

 that an acropolis savours rather of Tyranny than of Kingship : cp.
 тขpaveє́a катє́тка廿є, Plut. Timol. c. 24, and Juv. 10. 306 sq. That a level site was congenial to democracies may be inferred from the fact that the cities of Mantineia (Curtius, Peloponnesos, r. 239 : Bursian, Geogr. von Griechenland, 2.209) and Megalopolis (Curtius, $1.28 \mathrm{I} \mathrm{sq} .:$ Bursian, 2.244 ), both of them designed to be democratically ruled, were built on comparatively level sites. Aristotle does not explain why there should be more strong places than one in the central city of an àpıттokpatia (see above on 1273 a 19) perhaps he regards an ápıtтokpatio as giving a share of power to a plurality of social elements (virtue, wealth, and the demos), each of which would have a strong place of its own-but it is a fact that at Sparta, Carthage, and the Epizephyrian Locri, the seats of three famous ápıбтoкpatiat, there were more strong places than one






 Roman Geography, art. Sparta, vol. ii. p. 1026 b). The site of Carthage was 'a peninsula with water on three sides. On the three hills within this peninsula stood Carthage and its surroundings, its suburbs, and its necropolis' (E. A. Freeman, Contemporary Revicu, Sept. 1890, p. 368). See also Meltzer, Gesch. der Karthager, 2. 165 sqq. As to Locri, see Liv. 29. 6. 14 sqq. The seven hills of Rome, which was in its best days an àpıбтокрatia, are famous.



 (Griech. Gesch. 2.324) denies that Hippodamus was the first to lay out cities with straight streets. The Campanian Neapolis, he says, was laid out altogether in this way, and Selinus was laid out with two main streets crossing each other at right angles. 'New cities, therefore, were built in this fashion before the fifth century в.c.,' and all that Hippodamus did was to introduce the method in places of the highest importance. But is this view reconcilable with 2. 8. 1267 b 22 sq .?
25. ©́s єix xov кат $\alpha$ тòv dipxaîov xpóvov. Like Athens, of which we read in Pseudo-Dicaearch. De Graeciae Urbibus (Müller, Fr. Hist.
 $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ à $\chi$ хьóт $\eta \tau a$, and like Rome till its rebuilding by Nero (Tac. Ann. ${ }^{15} 5$. 43 , ceterum urbis quae domui supererant non, ut post Gallica incendia, nulla distinctione nec passim erecta, sed dimensis vicorum ordinibus et latis viarum spatiis cohibitaque aedificiorum altitudine ac patefactis areis). Compare also the contrast between the laying out of Rome and Capua in Cic. De Leg. Agrar. 2. 35. 96.
26. $\delta u \sigma \in \in \xi^{\prime} \delta \delta o s \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.t.ג., 'for that arrangement of private dwellings is hard of exit for foreign troops and hard of exploration for assailants [whether foreign or not].' The fate of the Thebans who were admitted into Plataea in B.C. 43 I is probably present to Aristotle's mind. They found much difficulty in escaping from the city when their attempt on it had failed (Thuc. 2. 4. 2, 5). Compare the difficult position in which Xenophon's troops found themselves in assaulting the city of the Drilae not far from


 $\left.\chi^{a \lambda} \epsilon \pi \dot{\prime}\right)$. An attacking force did not relish assaulting a city which it was at once difficult to explore, and consequently to reduce, and difficult to get out of in case of failure.


 $\kappa а \lambda \omega \bar{s}$ ). It is not quite clear whether Aristotle adds (in 29) каi $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$
 of his suggestion that the houses should be arranged in clumps or
quincunces, or as an alternative plan. Perhaps the former is the case. His plan will then be to drive straight wide streets between the clumps or quincunces of houses, but to leave the interior of each quincunx a tangle of narrow lanes. Compare J. R. Green's description of Roman London (Making of England, p. 106); it was 'little more than a mass of brick houses and red-tiled roofs, pierced with a network of the narrow alleys which passed for streets in the Roman world, and cleft throughout its area by two wider roads from the bridge.' Silchester and St. Alban's, however, were laid out with great regularity (Fox and St. John Hope, On the Desirability of the complete Excavation of the Site of Silchester, p. 4).

каӨáтєр к.т.ג., sc. катабкєváSoutat, 'as among farmers what some call clumps of vines are arranged.' For $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi \epsilon \in \lambda \omega \nu \sigma v \sigma \tau a ́ \delta a s, \mathrm{cp}$. Pollux, 7. 146, кaì छ̀vбтàs $\mu \epsilon \grave{\nu}$ каì $\sigma v \sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ * $\dot{\eta}$ ả $\mu \pi \epsilon \lambda o ́ \phi v \tau o s ~ \gamma \hat{\eta}, \dot{\eta} \mu \eta े$
 in clumps or quincunces, partly because they looked better when thus arranged, and partly because they were more productive (Varro, De Re Rustica, I. 7. 2 sqq.: Columella, 3. I3. 4 : Quintil. 8. 3. 9). The younger Cyrus seems to have planted trees in this way (Xen. Oecon. 4. 20 sqq. : cp. Cic. De Senect. 17. 59). Sus., following Scaliger, reads $\epsilon \in \nu$ toís $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma i o \iota s$ ('in the fields,' or 'farms') in place of $\epsilon \nu \tau o i s ~ \gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o i s$, which is the reading of all the MSS., but the word $\gamma \in \omega \rho \rho \iota o \nu$ is nowhere else used by Aristotle (is it used by any writer earlier than Philo, Mechan. Synt. p. 96, l. 49 Schoene?), and '̀ $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ oís $\gamma \in \omega \rho \gamma$ ois ('among farmers'), which is retained by Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, appears to be defensible : cp. Pherecr. Kopıa⿱⿲㇒́㇒, Fragm. 2 (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 28r),

є́̀ toís Maptavóvעoís ékeivoıs ßapßápoıs
$\chi$ útpas калоvิซt тàs $\mu \in \lambda a i v a s ~ i \sigma \chi a ́ \delta a s$,
 ' in the farms,' would probably be preferable to $\epsilon \begin{gathered}\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu \\ \tau o i s ~ \\ \gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma i o i s ~(c p . ~\end{gathered}$ Plato, Laws 762 A). But Aristotle often refers to practices prevailing among farmers (e.g. in De Gen. et Corr. 2. 8. 335 a 13 : Hist. An. 5. 32. 557 b 29 sqq.).
31. каì $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \epsilon \iota a \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~ к o ́ \sigma \mu o v . ~ S e e ~ c r i t i c a l ~ n o t e . ~$
 тón $\omega \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \rho \mu \nu \omega ิ \nu$. Aristotle has just pronounced in favour of an old-fashioned arrangement of private houses, and now he passes
on naturally enough to the question whether it is not the best plan to be old－fashioned in the matter of walls，and to dispense with them altogether．He has before him Plato，Laws 778 D，$\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{ }$

 Laws was pre－eminently one which laid claim to virtue（ 696 A ： 73 I A sqq．）．Agesilaus（［Plut．］Apophth．Lac．Ages．30）had been asked why Sparta had no walls，and had replied，Óvi$\lambda i \theta o \iota s ~ \delta \epsilon i ̂ ~ к a i ̀ ~$
 dictum was ascribed to Lycurgus（Plut．Lycurg．c．I9）．Isocrates had spoken of the Lacedaemonians as á $\rho \epsilon \tau \bar{\eta} s \dot{\mu} \mu \phi \iota \sigma ß \eta \tau o \hat{\nu} \nu \tau \in s$ in Archid． § 9 I ，and had used the expression rov̀s ápєт $\hat{\eta}_{S}$ àvтıтоьovuévous in
 Leutsch and Schneidewin，Paroem．Gr．2．57，ảp $\alpha$ aïкà фроveis：ク̈ro七 $\epsilon \dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \theta \eta$ ，where Aristoph．Nub． 82 I（Didot）and Plato，Euthydem． 295 C are referred to．

34．каì таûق＇оррิิvtєs к．т．入．This refers to the humiliation（cp．
 of Laconia inflicted on Sparta．For the sing．${ }^{\prime} p \gamma \varphi$, cp．Meteor． 1 ．




35．Ë́tı סè к．т．入．So far as this Aristotle agrees with Plato＇s

 $\mu \eta \chi^{\text {avàs }}$ к．т．$\lambda_{0}$ ）．Compare Thuc．1． $3^{2.5}$ ，where the Corcyreans say，


 $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \gamma \in \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．

37．є̇ $\pi \epsilon i$ §̀̀ к．т．入．Take the case of Plataea or Phlius besieged by the Lacedaemonians and their allies，or of Haarlem besieged by the forces of Spain（Motley，Rise of the Dutch Republic，Part 3，

 11． 1295 a 26，$\mu \eta \prime \tau \epsilon \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \rho \epsilon \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \sigma v \gamma к \rho i v o v \sigma \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ i ́ \pi \epsilon ̇ \rho ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~ i \delta i \omega ́ \tau a s, ~ E t h . ~$






 being a sign of effeminacy, as many thought (Plato, Laws 778 E : [Plut.] Apophth. Lac. Agis 6, Ages. 55, and Panthoid. I), they are really a sign of warlike forethought.
 things to the invention of the catapult made under Dionysius the



 ঠvעá $\mu \in \nu a \pi a \rho \in ́ \chi є \sigma \theta a \iota \mu \in \gamma$ á入as $\chi \rho \epsilon i a s$, and 14.50.4). The term $\mu \eta \chi a \nu a i$, however, probably includes not only catapults, but also batteringrams with shelter-sheds for those who worked them, movable wooden towers with drawbridges which could be lowered so as to give the besiegers access to the top of the city-wall, scaling-ladders, etc. (Droysen, Gr. Kriegsalterth. p. 209. I). Of these contrivances, catapults and (apparently) movable wooden towers were introduced into Greek warfare under Dionysius the Elder (Droysen, p. 2II). He had to contend against the Carthaginians, who were the first to use battering-rams and towers for sieges in the West, and whose use of them against the Greeks gave them a great superiority in their Sicilian campaigns (Meltzer, Gesch. der Karthager, 2. 134). His catapults and wooden towers revolutionized the art of besieging cities. They cleared the walls of their defenders and thus facilitated the use of the battering-ram. Nor did the development of the art stop here. As time went on, the towers became higher and better armed, and the battering-rams longer and better sheltered. The new methods of siege-warfare were inherited by Philip of Macedon, whose engines of war were famous (Demosth. Phil. 3. c. 50). See on the whole subject Droysen, op. cit. p. 2 II sqq. For eis

3. ö $\mu$ оьov $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. Taîs $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ finds its correlative in $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi \omega \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu$ and raîs oikṅ $\sigma \epsilon \sigma \iota$ taîs ióaıs. If we are to deprive cities of their defence for fear of making the citizens unmanly, why should we stop there? Why should we not deprive the territory and private dwellings of their defences also ?
 be easy of invasion,' for tival should be supplied with $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \epsilon \mu \beta u \lambda o v$.

Compare for the construction 1. 9. 1257 b 17 sqq. and Plato, Rep. 443 B and 375 E .
 mountainous spots,' as one might strip off an outer coating.


10. тaîs $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \mu \eta े$ кєктク $\mu$ évaıs. See critical note.
 as Sus. ${ }^{2}$ has already pointed out, quite wrongly : see Stallbaum on




 paid to them to secure that they shall be in a state befitting the city not only with a view to ornament, but also with a view to military procedures, both those already in use and those further ones which have recently been discovered.' The 'military procedures' here referred to are probably those of besiegers, not those of the
 cp. c. 8.1328 b II 8 (6). 8. 1322 a 34, and Plato, Phaedr. 239 D. How were walls to be made proof against recent improvements in siege-methods? By being made higher, for one thing, to resist scaling, and thicker, to resist battering-rams and heavy artillery (see Droysen, op. cit. p. 253). Aristotle's remark is perhaps based on the experience of Athens. The dangerous position in which she found herself after the defeat of Chaeroneia prompted a hasty effort to repair the walls (Aeschin. c. Ctes. cc. 27, 3r), which was continued in the years b.c. $334-326$ (Corp. Inscr. Att. 2. 167, referred to by Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 239, note I, and Droysen, op. cit. p. 237. I).
12. ӧтшs к.т.ג. For the order of the words see note on $\mathrm{I}_{3} 27$ а 4 .
 3, ò̀ ov̉ трómov.
16. $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \dot{e} \nu \in$ єüp $\eta$ тat. Many of these devices are mentioned in the Commentarius Poliorceticus of Aeneas Tacticus ( $\tau а к т \iota<\grave{\nu} \nu ~ \dot{~} \pi \delta \dot{\mu} \nu \eta \mu a$
 ing to Christ, Gesch. der gr. Litteratur, p. 308) soon after B. c. 360. It is the only part which has come down to us of a larger work
referred to by Polybius (10. 44) under the title of Tà $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$




 èmıßovגás. The Index Aristotelicus refers to no other passage in
 $1460 \mathrm{a} 33 \mathrm{sq} .$, however, approaches that of $\dot{a} \rho \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ here.
19. 'Eтєi ठè к.т.д. As the citizen-body must be divided into C.12. syssitia, and the walls must be dotted with guard-rooms and towers, it is a natural arrangement to locate some of the syssitia in the guard-rooms. Aristotle appears to intend the guard-rooms to be in the towers, but a common plan was to build city-walls solid only up to a certain height, and to place guard-rooms in them above that height (Droysen, op. cit. p. ${ }^{251}$ ). As to кatà tórous èmıaipous (with which Liddell and Scott compare Demosth. De Cor.
 along the wall close to a gate which needed guarding, or at an angle where two curtains of wall met which could be commanded by weapons discharged from the tower, or at intervals along the curtain. In times of pressing danger, and especially during a siege, it must have been a common practice for the defenders of the walls to take their meals either on them or close to them (cp.


 $\lambda_{\text {ıтотактоѝves, and Aelian, Var. Hist. 3. 14), but Aristotle's recom- }}^{\text {( }}$ mendation refers to times of peace as well as times of war, and it probably went far beyond the practice of most cities. We find, indeed, that the polemarchs of Cynaetha spent the day at the gates of their city (Polyb. 4. 18. 2, то入є́ $\mu a \rho \chi о \iota ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ к а т є \lambda \eta \lambda \nu \theta o ́ t \omega \nu ~ \tau \nu \nu e ̀ s ~$

 ôiautav ėmi $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \nu \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \nu \omega \nu)$, but Aristotle does not appear to be speaking here of high magistrates like polemarchs ; he seems rather to have in view some part of the military force of the State. For $\tau \grave{a} \tau \epsilon \dot{\chi} \eta$




 av̉r $\omega \bar{\nu}$, and 102 b 20 , but would read aủró in place of aủrá.
23. каì таûta $\mu \grave{̀} \nu \delta \grave{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda$. Taûta, 'these things,' probably refers not to ovvoritia, but to the matters which form the subject of the preceding sentence. Just as some of the syssitia and the guardrooms are to be conjoined, so we must conjoin the temples of the gods and the syssitia of highest authority. As to $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \delta \dot{\eta}^{\prime}$, Eucken remarks (De Partic. Usu, p. 46), 'diverso modo usurpatur, saepissime quidem ita ut inquisitione quadam finita omnia quae antecedunt comprehendat': he compares Phys. 1. 8. 19 1 b 27 , єîs $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \nu \grave{\eta}$ т $\tau$ ónos
 See also Bon. Ind. 173 a $3^{8} \mathrm{sqq}$.
24. tàs $\delta e ̀$ к.т.ג. The suggestion just made as to some minor syssitia leads on to the question where 'the highest syssitia of the magistracies' are to be placed ( $\tau \dot{a} \kappa v \rho \iota \omega ́ \tau a \tau a \tau \omega ิ \nu \dot{a} \rho \chi \epsilon i \omega \nu$ $\sigma v \sigma \sigma i \tau \iota a$, not
 of ${ }^{\prime} \nu \iota a \tau \omega ิ \nu \sigma v \sigma \sigma \iota \tau i \omega \nu$ still in his mind), and to the general question how the various syssitia are to be distributed over the city, for it is not proposed that all citizens-priests, magistrates lower and higher, and soldiers-should meet for meals at one and the same spot. On the contrary, the soldiers will have their syssitia on the walls, the highest magistrates and the priests on the hill on which the temples stand, and the less dignified magistrates near the


 $\theta \in i o t s=\tau o i s ~ \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \quad \theta \epsilon \omega \hat{\nu}$, 'the things of the gods,' and especially 'religious observances' (cp. Xen. Cyrop. 8. 8. 2, and Pol. 8 (6). 8. 1322 b 31, тà סaıдóvıa): so Lamb. 'rebus divinis,' while Vict. translates 'divinis naturis.' Aristotle takes pains to sever the temples and the highest magistrates from all else, keeping them apart even from the free agora, much more from the commercial agora:





 agora at Leontini seems to have been arranged on a plan
somewhat resembling that of Plato. Cp. Polyb. 7.6 , $\dot{\eta}$ रà $\rho \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$


 not tell us where he would place the more important law-courts; he would probably place the less important ones at any rate near the commercial agora. His scheme differs from that of Plato in another point. Plato reserves his acropolis in the Laws ( 745 B) for Hestia, Zeus, and Athena, whereas Aristotle brings all the gods together on the central hill except those whose temples must necessarily be placed elsewhere. He follows Plato, however, in placing the more important magistracies of the State-its stratêgi, treasurers, and auditors (8 (6). 8. 1322 a 30 sqq. : 6 (4). 15. 1300 b 9 sqq.) -in the immediate neighbourhood of the temples. Their moral influence would thus be strengthened and their sense of responsibility increased. Whether his plan of placing the ' Downing Street' of his State on the top of a hill was a wise one, may well be doubted. At Athens the magistrates lived not on the acropolis, but at its foot. It is true that at Athens the Boulê sometimes met in the acropolis (Xen. Hell. 6. 4. 20), and that at Megara the offices of the chief magistracy seem to have been in the acropolis (Plut. Ages. c. 27). The wisdom of separating the offices of the major from those of the minor magistracies seems also questionable. But Aristotle's wish is to gather together in one easily defensible spot the animating forces of his State : cp.




 severs the worship of the gods of the nether world from that of


 $\dot{d} \pi n o \delta i o \delta \dot{v} \tau a s)$. Among the temples to which Aristotle refers are probably those of Aesculapius, which were often situated outside




 '̇ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ). As to other temples, cp. Plutarch $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i} \dot{\eta} \sigma v x i a s ~ a p . ~ S t o b . ~$


 $\dot{\eta} \gamma \epsilon \mu \delta \dot{\nu} \epsilon s$ өєoi. The temples of Eileithyia in the Peloponnesus were often outside the gate of the city (Curtius, Peloponnesos, 2. 536); there was, for instance, a temple of Eileithyia outside the gate in the walls of Corinth which led to Tenea (Paus. 2.5.4). The same was occasionally the case with the temples of the Chthonian Demeter ; thus at Agrigentum 'the place chosen for' the Thesmophoria of Demeter 'was far beyond the walls of the elder city; it is barely within the walls of the enlarged city' (Freeman, Sicily, 2. 80), and at Syracuse the temple of Demeter and Persephonê 'was placed by Gelon outside the bounds of his enlarged city' (ibid. 2. 213 : see Diod. 14.63. ェ). For ó $\nu o ́ \mu o s$, cp. c. 17. 1336 b 16, $\epsilon i \mu \eta$
 an instance of the founding of a temple in a given spot in obedience to the commands of Delphi, cp. Paus. 1. 13. 8, кai $\sigma \phi \iota \iota \nu$
 aủт $̂$ каì ó חúppos тéGantat. Obedience was proverbially due to
 (i. e. Apollo at Delphi) rệ $\pi a \nu \tau i ~ a ̉ \mu \epsilon \iota \nu o \nu ~ \epsilon i ̂ v a \iota ~(~(\pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \Lambda v к o u ́ p \gamma o v ~$
 $\theta \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi v \theta o \chi \rho \eta ́ \sigma \tau o \iota s ~ \nu o ́ \mu o ı s ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a t: ~ S e x t . ~ E m p i r . ~ a d v . ~ M a t h . ~$
 ả $\nu a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta \pi \epsilon i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ к.т. .). Aristotle speaks only of the Delphic oracle, whereas Plato in Laws $73^{8} \mathrm{~B}$ sqq. makes a similar reservation in favour of the commands of those of Dodona and Ammon also, and even of $\tau \iota \nu$ ès $\pi a \lambda a \iota o \grave{~ \lambda o ́ y o t . ~}$
28. єi้ $\delta^{\prime}$ àv к.т. $\lambda_{\text {., ' 'and the place would be suitable which is }}$ such as to (ö́vis) possess adequate conspicuousness for the enthronement of virtue and a superiority of strength in relation to the adjacent parts of the city.’ For ó tómos ö $\sigma \tau t s$ (not ös), cp.

 $\tau \iota \mu \hat{\eta} \sigma a \iota \tau \grave{\nu} \pi \rho o ́ \theta v \mu o \nu$. For the use of the word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \emptyset \dot{\nu} \nu \in i a$ in a not very dissimilar sense, see the passages collected in Stallbaum's note on Plato, Alcib. I. 124 C. Aristotle continues the sentence in

 $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\chi} \neq \iota \nu$ in this double sense (transitive and intransitive), cp. Plato, Rep. 370 E , and Stallbaum's note. The 'virtue' referred to is apparently that of the gods and the supreme magistrates. That virtue should not be hidden, we see from Paroem. Gr. 2. 760 , $\mu \dot{\eta}$

 Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 2. 621): Pindar, Nem. 9. 6,

$\mu \eta ̀ \chi a \mu a i ̀ ~ \sigma \iota \gamma \underset{a}{a} \kappa a \lambda \nu ́ \psi a \iota:$
Hor. Carm. 4. 9. 29,
Paullum sepultae distat inertiae
Celata virtus:




$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { є̈ } \sigma \tau \iota ~ \tau ו s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~
\end{aligned}
$$

Temples especially were wont to be placed on conspicuous sites: see vol. i. p. 338, note I , and compare also Xen. Mem. 3.8. ro, vaois

 тробıéval, Corp. Inscr. Gr. 2 140. 35 (referred to by Bursian, Geogr. von Griechenland, 2. 83. 2), where the temple of Apollo in Aegina
 Polyaen. Strateg. 5. r. See also Hom. Hymn. in Aphrod. ioo sq. That the place assigned to the gods should be strong we see from Hdt. 5.67 ; there are obvious reasons why the abode of the chief magistrates should be so.
 àүopáv, 133 I b i. Karagkevív, 'provision' or 'establishment,' cp. 1331 b io, катєбкєváatat. The agora here referred to is to be below the hill on which the gods and the magistrates dwell, but
 be in this agora that the citizens would come together to elect magistrates, for magistracies were to be elective in Aristotle's 'best State' (c. 4. 1326 b 15 ), and here too the ecclesia would meet, if indeed, which is uncertain, Aristotle intends an ecclesia to exist. But the main function of this agora seems to be to serve as
a place for the enjoyment of leisure ( I 33 I b 12 ), the highest and best thing in human life (c. 14. 1333 a $3^{-\mathrm{b}} 3$ ). The buildings round it would not be the buildings which usually surrounded an agora. They would include no temples, for the temples were to be on the top of the hill above it, and no public offices either, if the public offices were also to be on the top of the hill, with the exception of those which adjoined the commercial agora. The only buildings which we are distinctly told would adjoin the 'free agora' are those of the gymnasium of the elders. These buildings are placed close to it, partly in order that the shady walks and the streams of the gymnasium may add a fresh charm to the agora, partly in order that the elder citizens may obtain recreation without straying from the region which is especially theirs, partly also perhaps in order that they may be encouraged to carry on in their years of maturity the physical training of their earlier years, and may not be tempted to drop it as they probably often did in ancient Greece. There were already cities in which the agora and the gymnasium were close together-e.g. Elis (Curtius, Peloponnesos, 2. 29) and Sparta (ibid. 2. 234)-but it should be noticed that Aristotle brings into the neighbourhood of his 'free agora' only the gymnasium of the elder men; if he had placed the gymnasium of the younger men near it, he would have seriously altered the character of the spot.
31. oïav к.т..., '(such an agora) as they call by the name of agora in Thessaly, for example-I mean the agora which they term " free." With ỏvoná̧ovolv we should supply ảrooáv: cp. Isocr.

 name.' The word ayopá was connected in the minds of Greeks with dyooás $\omega$, and to use the word as the Thessalians did of a place in which nothing was bought or sold would seem strange to them. Lambinus, followed by Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, Bonitz (Ind. 487 b 51), and Sus., would read vopiSovatv in place of b̀opáSovotv, but it seems to me that this change involves the loss of the point of the passage. For kai in the sense of 'for example,' see above on 1255 a $3^{6 .}$
 next line. The word eideíépos is occasionally used by Aristotle in opposition to àvaykaios (e.g. in I. II. 1258 b II), and we read of $\tau \grave{\nu}$ àvaүкaiav ảyopáv in 133 I b II. Camerarius (Interp. p. 305) refers to Xen. Cyrop. I. 2. 3 (a passage which Aristotle evidently







 $\gamma \in$ бо⿱órı. At the opposite pole to an agora of this kind stands


 Com. Gr. 4. 204). According to Holm, Gr. Gesch. 2. 309 (see also Busolt, Gr. Gesch., ed. 2, 3. I. $3^{6 r}$ ), the agora at Athens was divided into two parts, a Southern part used for political purposes, and a Northern part used for trade and social intercourse. That Aristotle would not be satisfied with a mere division of one and the same agora into two parts, we see from $\mathbf{1} 33$ I $\mathbf{b}$,
 Sparta and Rome in relation to this matter, see vol. i. p. 339, note I. The two kinds of agora are traceable in some Southern cities still. At Zara there is a Piazza dei Signori, and also a Piazza dell' Erbe (T. G. Jackson, Dalmatia, 1. 239, 243). At San Marino the Borgo, which is 'the business centre of the State,' where the market is held, is some little way below the town of San Marino; 'it lies on a small plateau beneath the steep long ridge with its three crags crowned with castles' on which the town is built (E. Armstrong, 'A Political Survival,' in Macmillan's Magazine, No. 375, Jan. 1891, p. 197).
33. каі $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \beta$ ávaưov к.т. $\lambda$. Supply єis $\hat{\eta} \nu \delta \epsilon i$. For mapaßá $\lambda \lambda \epsilon \iota \nu$, 'enter,' see Bon. Ind. s.v., where De Mir. Auscult. 8r. 836 a 28 , öтє . . . єis toútous toùs tómovs $\pi$ ápé $\beta a \lambda \epsilon$, is quoted among other passages.
35. єiŋ $\delta^{\prime} \hat{a}_{\nu}^{\nu}$ к.т. $\lambda$. At Athens in Aristotle's day the gymnasia were outside the walls, but Plato had already proposed a change in this respect (see vol. i. p. 338, note 2). One gymnasium at any rate at Thebes was outside the city (Xen. Hell. 5. 2. 25). At Sparta and Elis, on the other hand, the gymnasium was within the city (see above on 30 ), and this was the case also at Megalopolis (Paus. 8. 31. 8), and apparently at Pellene (Paus. 7.27.5: Curtius, Pelopon-
nesos, $\mathbf{I} .483$ ). The gymnasium built by the grave of Timoleon at Syracuse and called Timoleonteum was in the agora (Plut. Timol. c. 39). The plan of separating the gymnasium of the elder from that of the younger men may be borrowed by Aristotle from Sparta; we read at any rate in Plut. Cimon, c. 16 , of the ephebi and the young men ( $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu{ }^{\epsilon} \phi \dot{\eta} \beta \omega \nu$ кaì $\left.\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \epsilon a \nu i \sigma \kappa \omega \nu\right)$ ) exercising together in a stoa at Sparta as far back as the time of the great earthquake, when Archidamus, son of Zeuxidamus, was King. In the imaginary Persia of Xenophon's Cyropaedeia the boys, the ephebi, the fullgrown men, and those past the military age have each of them a separate part of the agora for their use (Xen. Cyrop. 1. 2. 4, quoted above on 3 r).
 ment' (or 'institution') 'also,' i.e. the gymnasia as well as the



 are two kinds of aióss, one genuine and the other not (cp. Dio Chrys. Or. 2 I. ${ }^{2} 73 \mathrm{M}$, $\uparrow \hat{\eta} s$ à̉ $\eta \theta \theta u \hat{\eta} s$ aìoovs). Phaedra in the Hippolytus of Euripides ( 363 Bothe: $3^{8} 5$ Dindorf) had already said,
but she is distinguishing between the aiò̀s which holds back where there should be no holding back and the aiò $\begin{gathered}s \\ \text { which is not }\end{gathered}$ inopportune. Aristotle's distinction, on the contrary, is drawn between the aiòs which befits freemen and the aiò ${ }^{\circ}$ s which does
 Fragm. ${ }^{7} 7^{8}$. 1507 b 22, 37 was probably miscalled aiôós by some. True ai̊ $\bar{\omega} s$ was rather to be sought in the respectful awe with which the Spartans regarded the members of the yepovaia (Aeschin.



 aióss which befits freemen may best be learnt from Plato, Laws ${ }^{6} 7 \mathrm{I}$ C sq. (where it is called $\theta$ eios $\phi \dot{\beta} \beta o s$ ), $647 \mathrm{~A}, 698 \mathrm{~B}$, and 699 C : we gather that it makes men obedient to law and order and content with their share of speech and silence, and also courageous and
good ( 699 C : cp. Democrit. Fragm. Mor. 235 Mullach). Compare Soph. Aj. ro73,




and the language of Protagoras in Plato, Protag. 322 D. At Sparta the presence of elders was held to be enough, in the absence of magistrates, to produce aióos (cp. Xen. Rep. Lac. 2. 10, ö $\pi \omega$ s




 Plut. Lycurg. c. 17 )-indeed, some held that the presence, or even the existence, of $\dot{\epsilon} \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ produced aiós (Xen. Symp. 8. 33 sq.: Plato, Symp. $\mathrm{I}_{78}$ D sq.) -but Aristotle thinks that nothing produces it so well as the visible presence of magistrates: cp. Xen. Cyrop. 8. r. 16 and Hell. 7.3.6, and on the whole subject Plut. Cleom. c. 9, a passage which shows that Aristotle's views were much influenced by those which prevailed at Sparta. A current proverb, however, is also probably present to his memory, aiòms èv $\dot{\delta} \phi \theta a \lambda \mu \hat{i}$ (Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. I. $3^{81}$ ): cp.



 passage.

 $\kappa_{.} \tau . \lambda .$, ' on a site easily made a meeting-point for all commodities, both those coming from the sea and those coming from the territory.' Compare the use of єi̇таракó $\mu \sigma \tau \sigma \nu$ in c. 5.1327 a 7 sqq.
4. $+\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ ost. See critical note.

єis ífpeîs, єis ăppoutas. See critical note. Here, as in 6 (4). 15 . 1299 a 16 sqq. (cp. 8 (6). 8. 1322 b I7 sqq.), priests are distinguished from magistrates.
5. kai tต̂v iєpéตv $\sigma v \sigma \sigma i t \iota \alpha$, i.e. as well as the syssitia of the chief magistracies. For the absence of $\tau a ́$ before $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ i $\epsilon \rho \epsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, see note on


VOL. III. E e
oporteat esse in fanis illis, ut serviant officio suo, quod sine scelere deseri non potest, facilius id praestabunt, si explebunt desideria corporis propinquo in loco.' Aristotle's aim probably is to secure more attention to their duties on the part of the priests than was often forthcoming from them. 'By the iepòs vóuos of Oropus ('E $\phi$.

 the remainder of his time in the city, where he had a civil occupation in addition to his sacred office. Compare von Wilamowitz, Hermes, 21. 93 ' (Toepffer, Attische Genealogie, p. 160. 2).
 supplying rá $\grave{\iota} \nu$. Compare the suppression of $\delta \iota a \nu o \mu \eta \dot{\eta}$ in Plato, Laws 745 D.
6. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime}$ ảpxєícv к.т.ג., 'but all thes magistracies which have in their charge contracts and indictments in lawsuits and callings into courts and other administrative work of the kind just mentioned.' Aristotle does not rate these functions highly (cp. 6 (4). 15. 1300 b 10 sqq.), nor does Plato (Rep. $4_{25} 5 \mathrm{C}$ sqq.). The magistracies which have the supervision of contracts are here marked off from

 $\pi \epsilon \rho i ́ \tau \epsilon \tau \grave{a} \sigma v \mu \beta o ́ \lambda a \iota a$ каi $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \epsilon \dot{\kappa} \kappa о \sigma \mu i a \nu$, the functions of the agoranomi are implied to include the supervision of contracts. Aristotle is perhaps here thinking of magistrates with whom contracts were registered: see as to these 8 (6). 8. 1321 b 34 sqq. and note.


 too grand for the functions of the office. See note on 1317a 18. Yet Aristotle adds oi ka入oú $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{o}$ to such simple and everyday words as $\gamma \epsilon \omega \rho \gamma o i$ and $\beta a \operatorname{vavaro\iota }$ in $6(4) \cdot 4$. 1290 b 40 sq ., so that the addition of $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa а \lambda o v \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \eta \nu$ here may need no special explanation.
10. трòs ảץopậ $\mu$ èv $\delta \in \hat{\imath ̂}$ к.т. $\lambda$., 'must be established near indeed to some agora and place of public concourse, but the place adapted for the business done by them is [not the place near the free agora, but] the place near the necessary agora, for,' etc. For oúvodos, see note on 1319 a 31. For totoûtos, cp. 1331 a 28. For the contrast

 the infinitive expresses the purpose, see Goodwin, Moods and

Tenses，§ iTo，who refers among other passages to Plato，Phaedr．
 סéóoктal，and Thuc．2．44．2．For $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ äva，cp．Thuc．1．93．9，đóv $\tau \epsilon$
 1332 a 30 sq ．
 activities，［with the supervision of which these magistracies are concerned］．＇
 be distributed on the plan which has been described，＇i．e．so that sites shall be allotted for guard－houses and syssitia of magistrates in them and for temples．Aristotle here has before him Plato，




 of Plato（Laws 760 B sqq．）in creating the magistracy of the agronomi to keep watch and ward over the rural districts．We nowhere find a mention of àpovóно except in the writings of Plato and Aristotle，nor of $\dot{v} \omega \omega \rho o i$ except in the Politics（Gilbert， Gr．Staatsalt．2．333），though Suidas has an article under the head of $i \lambda \eta \omega \rho o i$. See as to these magistrates below on 1321 b 27．Plato had already established syssitia for the agronomi



 implied to be the protection of property against robbers），and Rhet． 1．4． 1360 a 6 sqq．Фu入aктípta were scattered over Attica（see Gilbert，Const．Antiq．of Sparta and Athens，Eng．Trans．，p． $3{ }^{12}$ ， note r；and Haussoullier，Vie Municipale en Attique，p．193）；we read in Xen．De Vect．4． 43 of a teîरos at Anaphlystus and of another at Thoricus．A description of the castle at Oenoe will be found in Droysen，Gr．Kriegsalterthümer，p．259．We may perhaps infer from Laws 848 C sqq．（quoted above）that Greek villages often had a fortress on high ground towering over them quite in the style which we associate with the middle ages．These фu入aктípta furnished quarters for the young citizens of Athens during the year in which they served as $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ íoえot（＇A $\theta$ ．по入，c． $42, \S 4$ ，with Sandys＇
 tà фpoúpta). How important a part they sometimes played in the defence of the State appears from Diod. 14. 57. 6 , where we read that after the city of Messana in Sicily had been captured by the
 citizens had taken refuge, offered a successful resistance.
 all over the territory, some for gods and others for heroes.' Cp. Plato, Laws 848 D , where it is arranged that in each village there shall be temples of the gods каì тิิข $\dot{\epsilon} \pi о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ $\theta \epsilon o i ̂ s ~ \delta a u \mu o ́ \nu \omega \nu: ~ e l s e-~$ where also in the Laws he recommends worship to be paid not only to gods and heroes but also to $\delta a i \mu o \nu \epsilon s$ (Laws 717 B, $\mu \epsilon \tau \dot{a}$
 rov́rovs: cp .738 B and D ). As to the position given by Plato to סaipoves, see the passages from his writings referred to by Zeller, Plato, Eng. Trans., p. 501, note 38. Plutarch says (De Defect. Orac.



 between gods and סaiцovєs (cp. Пєрi $\tau \hat{\eta} s \kappa a \theta^{\prime} \tilde{\pi} \pi \nu o \nu \mu a \nu \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\eta}$, с. 2. 463 b i3 sqq.), and his silence in this passage about $\delta a i \mu o \nu \epsilon s$ is significant. That heroes were believed sometimes to fight for the State which worshipped them, appears from Diod. 5 5.53.4. Attica was full of village-shrines (Liv. 31. 26: see Thirlwall, Hist. of Greece, 8. 290). We see from the passage before us that the word iєpóv was used of the building dedicated to a hero, though the sacred enclosure round it was properly called not a $\tau \epsilon ́ \mu \epsilon \nu 0 s$, but a $\sigma \eta$ кós (Pollux, 1. 6).


 Kaì $\lambda$ '́rovtas is added in contradistinction to $\pi$ o七ov̀vtas, cp. 20 sqq. T $\omega$ ข $\tau o t o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$ is repeated in 19 and 22 , and in 20 we have tà tolaûta. See note on 1284 b 28 .
20. oủ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \chi^{\alpha} \lambda \epsilon \pi$ óv к.т. $\lambda$. There is a designed antithesis between
 For the contrast of $\nu o \eta \eta_{\sigma a \iota}$ and $\pi o \imath \eta \sigma a \iota, \mathrm{cp}$. Metaph. Z. 7. 1032 b 15 sqq. Aristotle has before him Plato, Laws 745 B , 兀ò $\delta \dot{\eta} \eta \in \tau \alpha ̀$


 Philem. 'Eфєঠpìta, Fragm. 2 (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 10),
 Bonitz (Ind. 303 a 54 ) compares c. 13. 1332 a 29, סı̀̀ kar' $\epsilon \dot{x} \chi \grave{\eta} \nu$


 àv épyov, and $^{\text {[Plut.] De Liberis Educandis, c. } 20 \text { sub fin., tò } \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu}$
 zori. For the use in the same sentence of the pres. infin. $\lambda \in \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \gamma \in \boldsymbol{\iota}$ and the aor. infin. $\sigma v \mu \beta \bar{\eta} v a$, cp. c. 13. 1332 a 28 sq. and 6 (4). I. 1289 a 3 sq. Cp. also 8 (6). 4 . 13 18 b 2 I sq.
24. Пєpì $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ т $\hat{S}$ modıтєias aủtท̂s к.т.ג. The contents of the C. 13. thirteenth and following chapters have been sketched in vol. i. p. 340 sqq. The answer given in them to the question here raised is-a State that is to be happy must consist of citizens who are endowed by nature, fortune, and education with the means of making an absolutely, and not merely conditionally, perfect use of virtue, or in other words of citizens who are not only good men ( $\sigma$ Tovoaiot ), but are also supplied with an adequate amount of bodily and external goods, i.e. of citizens possessed of à $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ кє $\chi \circ \rho \eta \gamma \eta \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \eta$ ( 1332 a 28 sqq.: 6 (4). 2. 1289.a 32 sq.). Aristotle insists on this because he holds that Plato had starved the life of his guardians in the Republic and robbed it of happiness (2. 5. I 264 b 15 sqq.), and had sought to construct a happy State without making any class of his citizens happy (see vol. i. p. $4^{27}$ sq.) ; he probably thought that Plato would not have made this mistake if he had studied the nature of happiness more closely. Aristotle's own ideal of a happy State, which is a sound and noble one, is conceived in direct and designed contrast to that of Plato's Republic and also to the model of the Lacedaemonian State. His ideal State consists of a body of citizens fully supplied with absolute goods and living a life in which work is crowned with leisure, yet unspoilt by their good fortune and enabled by a wisely ordered education to use their leisure aright. For $\tau \hat{\eta} s ~ \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i u s ~ a u ̀ \tau \eta ̀ s, ~$ ' the constitution itself, as distinguished from matters outside it,' see above on 1326 b 35, and cp. Plut. De Cohib. Ira, c. 12, where aủrì

 (i.e. to the proposer of the law) oviôeís éotı kivòvdos. For ék tivav xaì '́k $\pi$ oi $\omega \nu$, cp. c. 10. 1329 b 40, and see above on 1274 b 32. As to the repetition of $\dot{\epsilon}$, see critical note.
26. '̇ँचєi $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The apodosis is introduced by $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ oủv, 39 , as in c. 2. 1324 a 19 sqq., where see note. Plato (Laws 962 A) and Isocrates (De Pace, § 28 and Epist. 6. 8) had already dwelt on the importance in any inquiry of ascertaining both the end and the means of attaining it. For $\tau \grave{o} \epsilon \mathcal{v}^{3}$, see Bon. Ind. 29 I b 25 sqq.

 See note on the latter passage.
28. Ê้ $\delta e ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ k . т . \lambda ., ~ n o t ~ e ́ v ~ \tau \hat{̣}$ rás: see above on 1330 b 10.

31. Ёккєєтає ка入ิิs, 'is proposed well.' Compare (with Liddell and Scott) Megasthenes, ap. Strab. p. 707, toîs $\delta^{\circ}$ ó $\pi \lambda$ отоoîs кaì


$\epsilon^{\epsilon} v \tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \rho a ́ r \tau \epsilon \iota v$, as distinguished from tò $\nu 0 \in i v$, which is a prior stage: cp. Metaph. Z. 7. 1032 b 6 sqq.
33. ótè $\delta \grave{\text { è }}$ к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. The Platonic Socrates in the Republic is charged with this twofold error in 2. 2. 1261 a II-I6.
34. oîov $\pi \epsilon р i ̂ ~ i a r p \iota к \eta \dot{v, ~ s c . ~ \delta \iota a \mu a \rho т a ́ v o v a \iota \nu: ~ c p . ~ P l a t o, ~ L a w s ~} 962 \mathrm{~A}$,

 фаіуоито;
36. ӧpov here $=\tau$ т́̇дos.
38. кратєívөal, 'obtineri' (Bon. Ind. s. v.) : see Vahlen on Poet.

 таút $\nu \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$. See vol. i. p. 341, note I.
tàs єis tò тénos $\pi \rho a ́ \xi \in i s$. We expect $\pi \rho o ́ s$ in place of $\epsilon i s$, but cp .

 Под. с. 23 , тà єis тò̀ $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu$.
 фavepóv. Here the apodosis begins. Aristotle perhaps remembers
 and the argument which follows. Cp. also Rhet. 1. 5.1360 b 4 ,



40. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \dot{\alpha}$ roútwr к.т. $\lambda$. As to those who have not the power to attain happiness, cp. c. 8. 1328 a $3^{8}$ sqq. In some of these there is a defect of фv́ous (c. 13. 1332 a 40 sqq.: 7 (5). 12. 1316 a 8 sqq.) ; this is the case with natural slaves (3.9.1280 a 33 sq.). In others there is a defect of túx (4I sqq. : cp. 6 (4). II. 1295 a 27 ,
 Plato, Laws 747 C (quoted in vol. i. p. 34 I , note 2) and 934 D.
41. Seîtaı $\gamma \grave{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ к.т.入. This is added in explanation of $\delta \iota a ́$ тıva $\tau \dot{\chi} \eta \eta$, for a defect of Xop $\begin{aligned} & \text { ria is due to a defect of fortune. Kai }\end{aligned}$


1. тоútou $\delta$ к̀ к.т.入. Aristotle probably remembers a saying of 1332 a . Pelopidas recorded by Plutarch, Pelop. c. $3, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \phi i \lambda \omega \nu \nu o v \theta \epsilon \tau o u ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$

 Aelian, Var. Hist. Ir. 9. Cp. also Plut. Aristid. et Cato inter se




2. oi $\delta^{\prime}$ єủ̈ùs к.т. $\lambda$. Eủ $\theta$ ús, 'from the outset,' because, unlike the others, who start aright but fail later on, they are wrong at starting. So we read in 5 (8). $5 \cdot 1339$ b 3 r sqq. that there are persons who scek happiness in the pleasures of recreation, mistaking them for the pleasures of the true end of life. Cp. Eurip. Hippol. 360 Bothe ( 382 Dindorf), where some are said to miss what is good,
 đ̈̀ $\lambda \lambda \eta \nu \tau \nu \nu$,
and Arrian, Epictet. 3. 23. 34.
3. фацє̀̀v $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. As to the question whether we have here a reference to the Nicomachean Ethics, see vol. i. Appendix F. Aristotle has already given part of this definition in c. 8. 1328 a 37,
 т́̇ $\lambda_{\epsilon}$ os. We find a similar definition of evjounovia ascribed to the





 ảjâ̄̂̀ (Zeller, Plato, Eng. Trans., p. 579. 62), but Aristotle sub-


 6. 4. II40a 2 sq., and Metaph. M. 1. 1076 a 28), and also Eth. Nic.
 after кai, but probably wrongly ; this may be a gloss on фaرév which has crept into the text.
4. каì таútŋv к.т...., i. e. ' and this perfect use of virtue not an use of virtue conditionally, but absolutely,' or, in other words, not a merely necessary use of virtue, but a noble use of virtue. A conditional use of virtue is an use of virtue which is called for under certain circumstances: for instance, if an offence has been committed, it is under the circumstances an use of virtue to punish the offender, but this is not an absolute use of virtue, because it is an use of virtue dictated by circumstances not desirable in themselves; it is the adoption and acceptance of an evil for the sake of the good which under the circumstances it will ultimately produce, whereas an absolute use of virtue is concerned with absolute goods, not with evils which are under given circumstances goods; it is concerned with the calling into existence of honours and wealth. In depicting the life of the citizens of his 'best State,' Aristotle often has in his mind the model furnished by the life of the gods (e.g. in c. r. $1_{3} 3^{2} b^{b}{ }^{2} 3$ sqq. and c. 3 . 1325 b 28 sqq.), and here too he probably remembers the $\theta$ eoi $\delta \omega \tau \bar{\eta} \rho \epsilon \in$ éáov of Homer





 Meineke's note, Fragm. Com. Gr. 4. $\mathrm{I}_{53}$ : and the remarks of Plutarch on the epithet 'Olympian' conferred on Pericles in Pericl.






 diôıkías）．
 ally＂I mean things which are necessary＇：i．e．things which are necessary if good is to come about，but which are not in themselves



 aỉtia àvá $\gamma \kappa \eta$ тis є̇สтıv aüтๆ．Cp．also Eth．Eud．7．2． 1238 b 5，каì


 take just actions＇（i．e．uses of the virtue justice），＇just vengeances and punishments proceed indeed from virtue＇（i．e．are uses of virtue），＇but they are necessary，＇i．e．not desirable in themselves， ＇and are noble only in a necessary way．＇Aristotle here has before him，and slightly corrects，Plato，Laws 728 C ，тои̂тo oủ̀ ס $\grave{\eta}$ тò $\pi a ́ \theta o s$


 860 B the difficulty of classing just punishments either as кa入á or as aioxpá is dwelt on，and Aristotle himself says in Rhet．1．9．1366 b


 For the difference between $\tau \iota \mu \omega$ рia and кó入абıs，cp．Rhet．ェ．хо．

 Eth．Nic．4．II．II 26 a 26 sqq．，and Gell．6．14，puniendis peccatis tres esse debere caussas existimatum est．Una est quae $\nu$ ov $\theta \in \sigma i a$ vel кó入aбıs vel mapaiveणıs dicitur；cum poena adhibetur castigandi atque emendandi gratia，ut is qui fortuito deliquit attentior fiat correctiorque．Altera est quam ii qui vocabula ista curiosius diviserunt $\tau \iota \mu \omega$ pià appellant．Ea caussa animadvertendi est， cum dignitas auctoritasque eius in quem est peccatum tuenda est，ne praetermissa animadversio contemptum eius pariat et hono－ rem levet；idcircoque id ei vocabulum a conservatione honoris


 also Laws 628 C sqq. For $\mu$ év solitarium, see above on 1262 a 6 and 1270 a 34 . Here the suppressed clause is 'though it is desirable that, if punishments are needed, they should be inflicted.'
 production of] honours and wealth are the noblest actions in an






 dicus, indeed, according to Plato, Charm. 163 D, would give the

 кòáócts. As Schneider points out in his Addenda (2. 506), Sepulveda (p. 229: see his note, p. 230 b, which Schneider quotes) translates, 'illud enim est malum tollere,' but, as aipetis can hardly bear this meaning, Schn. would read avaipsots in place of it, and this reading is adopted by Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ and Sus. The change certainly makes the antithesis neater, for kakoû тuv̀s àvaipetııs answers well to кatarкєvaì à $\mathbf{\gamma a \theta} \hat{\omega} \nu$ кaì $\gamma \in \nu \nu \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon s$, and it receives support (which has not hitherto been observed, so far as I have seen) from Plato,


 any rate regarded punishment as the 'removal of an evil,' the 'evil' being the wickedness of the offender, but the question is whether Aristotle took this view of punishment. This is very doubtful. He says indeed in Rhet. 1. 14. 1374 b 3r, кaì [äठíкnرa

 (cp. Eth. Nic. 2. 2. 1104 b 16 sqq. and Eth. Eud. 2. 1. 1220 a 35 sqq.). But it is one thing to say that punishment heals the injustice committed, and another to say that it heals and removes the wickedness of the wrong-doer. I incline on the whole to think that the reading of the MSS., kakov ruv̀s aïperts, is right, and to regard the گ̇пpia as the кaxóv $\tau \iota$ referred to: cp. Eth. Nic. 5. 7.



 civelva means the penalty inflicted as a result of the $\epsilon \dot{v} \theta u v a$ properly so called, see Bernays, Dialoge des Aristoteles, p. 16). The meaning of the sentence will then be that just punishments are 'a choice of what is in a degree an evil' (i. e. of $\beta \lambda a ́ \beta \eta$ or $\zeta \eta \mu i a)$. This interpretation harmonizes well with what follows in 19 sqq. (see the next note); it also has the merit of giving the proper force to какоиิ тıvós, where тıvós softens какой and marks the contrast with
 тıvós, ó yà $\rho$ vó $\mu$ os סíkatóv тı), and with the фav̂入aı тúXaı mentioned in 20. Evil is not a fit object of choice; men should choose the good (Plato, Protag. $35^{8} \mathrm{C}$ sq. : Gorg. 499 E : Isocr. De Pace § ıо6:

5. хрท́баเто $\delta$ ' àv к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle continues, 'Yes, and a good man would make an in some sense noble use of virtue in relation not only to evils which are in the particular case goods (such as just punishments), but also to absolute evils like poverty, disease, and other evil contingencies ; still beatitude is not to be found in them but in their opposites. For the use which the good man makes of things which are not goods to him-and no things are goods to him which are not absolute goods-is not an absolutely noble use, and therefore happiness is not to be found in it, for we have defined happiness to be an absolutely noble use of virtue.' Aristotle perhaps has before him a saying which Plutarch places in the mouth of Epaminondas in De Gen. Socr. c. 14, ả $\lambda \lambda^{\top} a \mathfrak{a} \pi a ́ \gamma-$




 Carm. 4. 9. 46 ,

> rectius occupat
> Nomen beati, qui deorum
> Muneribus sapienter uti
> Duramque callet pauperiem pati.




1065 a 35 sq . What Aristotle includes under фav̂גaı túxat may

 the passage before us may be traced in Stob. Ecl. Eth. 2. 6. 12,
 $\epsilon \not \epsilon \sigma \pi a \iota$. For the conjunction of $\pi \epsilon \nu \dot{\prime}$ a and $\nu o ́ \sigma o s, \mathrm{cp}$. Bacchylides I . 32 sq. and Plato, Protag. 353 D.



 however, we trace a nearer approach to the definition before us in


 passages referred to by Eaton), but there is nothing in either
 II 6 b 8 sqq. For the thought compare Plato, Laws 66 I C sq.
23. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda o v \delta^{\prime}$ '̈ть к.т.入., 'and it is evident that [just as absolute goods are absolutely good and noble, so] these uses also' (i. e. the good man's uses of absolute goods) 'are necessarily absolutely good and noble.'
25. Sıò к.т. $\lambda$., 'hence,' i. e. because men see that the uses made by the $\sigma \pi$ ovóaios of absolute goods are absolutely good and noble and confer happiness on him, men think that external goods are the causes of happiness, forgetting that the $\sigma \pi$ ovoaios owes his happiness not to them but to his own virtue, and that even in his case they are only conditions, not causes, of happiness, while in the case of those who are not $\sigma$ tovodaio they may be the causes not of happiness, but of unhappiness, inasmuch as they may not be goods at all to them. For äv $\theta \rho \omega \pi o \iota$, cp. Plato, Symp. 189 C ,

 where see Stallbaum's critical note. We have oi äv $\theta \rho \omega \pi \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ in 2. 7. 1267 a 2 sq. and in Rhet. I. I. $1355^{\text {a }} 15$, just as we sometimes have ${ }_{\alpha} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o s$ and sometimes ó ${ }^{a} \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi$ os (see critical note on 1253 a 2). For the fact that men take external goods to be the causes of happiness, cp. Eth. Nic. 1. 9. ro99 b 6 sqq. and 7. 14. II53 b 21 sqq., and Plut. De Virt. et Vit. c. I.


27．aittê̂to．For the absence of tis，cp．Eth．Nic．3． 5.1113 a 2 ，
 Bonitz，Ind． 589 b 47 sqq．

28．àvaүкаiov toívuv к．т．．．．，＇it is necessary，therefore，as a result of what has been said，＇etc．：see above on 1267 b 14 ．Tà $\mu$ év， i．e．the external goods which are the gifts of Fortune．For $\dot{v} \pi a \dot{\rho}-$ $\chi$ etv and $\pi$ apagkeváaal see note on 133 r b 2 I．

29．Sıò к．т．ג．These words are susceptible of two interpreta－
 translate with Sepulv．＇precibus optamus＇（so Vict．and Lamb．），or we may supply civau and translate＇hence in respect of those things over which fortune is supreme we pray that the composition of the State may be all that can be wished．＇Perhaps the second interpretation is the better．Compare with the passage before us Soph．Fragm．73 I，

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \zeta \eta \tau \hat{\omega}, \tau 亠 ⿱ 八 乂 力
\end{aligned}
$$


 science is not enough by itself：cp．3．13．1284a i，$\pi \rho \dot{\rho} s \delta_{\grave{\epsilon}} \tau_{\grave{\eta} \nu}$

 noticed that if，as we are told in 39 sq. ，фúrus is one of the sources of virtue，it does not entirely depend on the lawgiver whether the citizens are virtuous or not．It is impossible，for instance，to turn barbarians into Greeks：still much may be done by attention to marriage and rearing to secure that the＇nature＇of the citizens is what it should be．

32．ä $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa . \tau . \lambda$ ．It is implied here that a man might be a citizen without sharing in the constitution ：see vol．i．p． 229.

34．$\eta \mathfrak{\eta} \hat{\imath} \nu \delta$ غ̀ к．т．ג．，＇but in our State all the citizens share in the constitution，［so that all our citizens must be good］．＇See as to this vol．i．p． 324 and note $\mathbf{1}$ ，and Appendix B sub fin．Here Aristotle seems to use the word $\pi$ onitau in a sense exclusive of the
 it is implied that oi öтлa кєктпиévor do not share in the constitution．
 lines of Eupolis（Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr．2．457）Nicias asks Aristides，
and Aristides answers,
36. каì ү $\dot{\rho} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. It is more desirable that each individual citizen should be good than that all the citizens collectively should be good but not each individual citizen, because in the former case not only will each citizen be good but all will be good, and a good which includes another is more desirable than the good which it includes (Top. 3. 2. 117 a 16 sqq.). It appears from 2.5. 1264 b

 happy if only some of its members are happy.
 1387 b 7. Cp. also Pol. 3. 9. 1280 b 12, ảyäoùs кaì סıкaious. Eaton and Congreve compare Eth. Nic. 10. 10. 1179 b 20, yiveo $\theta a \iota \delta^{\prime}$
 Eth. Nic. r. ro. ro99b 9 sqq. The passage before us is perhaps present to the mind of the writer of [Plut.] De Liberis Educandis,

 (already quoted by Eaton). Theognis (429-438) and Pindar (Olymp. 9. 100 sqq.: Nem. 3. 40 sqq. : see L. Schmidt, Ethik d. alten Griechen, $1 . ~ x 58$ sqq.) are already familiar with the contrast of nature and teaching as sources of virtue, and both insist on the importance of nature, but the maxim in the form in which it appears in the passage before us is perhaps found earliest in Protag. Fragm. 8 (Mullach, Fr. Philos. Gr. 2. 134), фúधєos кaì
 only of virtue, but of other things, and which are all the more remarkable as coming from Protagoras, because there were sophists who promised to teach virtue without dwelling on the necessity of natural aptitude and of practice (Plato, Meno 95 B). Compare (with Camerarius, Interp. p. 309) Hippocr. Lex, vol. i. p. 3 Kühn, if this

 є̇̇фvéos, $\pi a \iota \delta \quad \mu a \theta i \eta s, \phi i \lambda o \pi o v i \eta s, ~ \chi$ póvov. The saying reappears in Xen. Mem. 3. 9. 2, Plato, Phaedr. 269 D, and Isocr. De Antid.§ 187. See also Wyttenbach's note on the passage of [Plut.] De Liberis Educandis quoted above. "EOos is mentioned before גóyos, because
education through habit precedes education through the reason (5 (8). 3. 1338 b 4 sq. : Eth. Nic. 10. 10. 1179 b 23 sqq.).
40. каì $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ фûvaı к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle perhaps remembers a saying variously ascribed to Thales, Socrates, and Plato: cp. Diog. Laert.






 $\Sigma \omega \kappa$ рátous $\chi$ рóvoıs ản $\eta \nu \tau \eta \sigma \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \sigma \iota s$ aủroù. See Prof. J. E. B. Mayor in Class. Rev. 10. 19r.
 a certain quality in body and soul.' For oũt see critical note. Aristotle continues with oür $\omega$ as if $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$, and not $\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau o \nu$, had preceded, for I do not think that oũт here means 'then,' as it seems to do in Rhet. 3. 19. 14r9 b 15 . That a man may be born too faulty to be made good by education, we see from $7(5)$. 12 . 1316 a 8 sqq.
42. Ë้L to be born this or that, for habits cause them to change; some qualities, in fact, are made by nature to be susceptible of change under the influence of habits in two directions, towards that which is worse and that which is better.' I follow Stahr and Welldon in my
 well make $\frac{\epsilon}{\nu} \nu a$ the subject of $\phi \hat{v} \nu a \iota$. In $\notin \nu \iota a$ Aristotle refers to those elements in man which may be made better or worse by good or bad habituation, for instance the emotions : see note on 1253 a 34 ,











 as in Rhet. 2. 12. 1389 a 19 sq. and De Part. An. 2. 13. 657 a 3 1 sq. (Eucken, Praepositionen, p. 73).





 For the implied contrast between ф́vəs and $\lambda$ ózos, cp. 1. 2. 1252 a 28 sqq., where a contrast between фúvıs and $\pi \rho o a i p \epsilon \sigma \iota s$ is implied.
 guided by habits also.' For $\mu \iota \kappa \rho a ́, ~ c p . ~ P l a t o, ~ R e p . ~ 404 ~ A, ~ e ́ a ̀ \nu ~$
 $\gamma \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \tau \rho i a s{ }_{\epsilon} \mu \pi \epsilon \iota \rho o \iota$. As to the habituation of animals, cp. [Plut.]




5. $\mu$ óvov, sc. Tต̂ע 乌థ̣̂

$\tilde{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon \delta \in \hat{\imath}$ к.т. $\lambda$. ., 'and so [in his case] these three things must harmonize with each other, [for it will not do to leave reason out,] since men are led by reason to do many things contrary to habituation and to nature, if they are persuaded that these things are better done otherwise [than as habit and nature dictate].' We learn from c. 55.1334 b 9 sqq. that the three things must not only harmonize, but harmonize in the best way, i.e. by all being adapted to the best end. Plato speaks of education in Laws 653 B as being the bringing of the child's feelings of pain and pleasure into harmony


 for, if we place these words there, what Aristotle says will be that nature and habit should harmonize, whereas the lesson which he wishes to enforce is surely this, that nature, habit, and reason should harmonize. As to $\pi o \lambda \lambda \grave{a} \gamma \dot{a} \rho-\beta$ éd $\lambda \iota o v$, Laius in the Chrysippus of Euripides (Fragm. 837) had been made to plead,


but the Chorus in Aristoph. Vesp. 1457 sqq. (Didot) says,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { тò } \gamma \text { à } \rho \text { àroat } \bar{\nu} \nu a \iota \chi^{a \lambda \epsilon \pi o ̀ \nu}
\end{aligned}
$$

$\mu \epsilon \tau \epsilon \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda$ дито тuv̀s трómous.




 év roîs $\lambda$ óyous $\mu \eta \nu \nu$ ق́ćntos ápíatov. A reference is given in the Index

 in the writings of Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, or Isocrates ; it occurs, however, in [Demosth.] Or. 17. c. 27, and it is frequently used by Polybius not only in the singular, but also in the plural (e.g. in I. I7. II and 3. 76. I2).
9. For $\delta \iota \omega$ pí $\mu \epsilon \theta \alpha$ in a middle sense, cp. Demosth. c. Timocr. c. 192 (Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective, s. v. ó $\langle\zeta \omega)$. $\Delta \iota \omega \rho \iota \sigma \mu a \iota$ does not appear to be often thus used by Aristotle: Bonitz, however (Ind. 200 a 27), takes $\delta \iota \omega$ pí $\theta a \iota$ to be middle in De Caelo, 4. 2. 308 b I.

 ápєт $\eta \nu$ in $\mathrm{r}_{3}{ }_{2} 7$ b 38 .
 answers to тò̀ $\lambda o ́ \gamma o \nu, 7$. Here $\mu a \nu \theta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ includes both $\epsilon \theta i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and






 9. 1. 608 a 17 sqq., and Metaph. Ө. 5. 1047 b 3 I, ámaб $\omega$ ע $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$




VOL. III.
oủk ả ár $^{\prime} \eta$ ．Add Philem．Inc．Fab．Fragm． 6 （Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr． 4．34：cp．5．ccxxxii），

ทెкоvба тоиิто каủтós，oủòє̀ фúєтaє
aủrónaтov à $\nu \theta \rho \dot{\omega} \pi о \iota \sigma l \nu$ ，ढ̄ $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$ ，עoûs，






Étépous tivaı，sc．סià ßíov．





16．єỉ $\mu$ èv toívuv к．т．$\lambda$ ．Here Aristotle has before him Plato，


 5． 1254 b 34 sqq．and Isocr．Hel．§56，roîs ס̇̀ кa入oís єủ⿴囗ेs io̊óvtєs

 The passage before us shows that not only gods（1．5．I254 b 34 sqq．） but also heroes were credited with surpassing personal beauty，so that we are not surprised to find that Philip of Crotona，who excelled in this respect，was worshipped as a hero at Egesta after his death （Hdt．5．47）．For är $\epsilon \rho \frac{\iota}{\tau} \tau \nu$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$（not $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$ ），see Bon．Ind．

 365 a 3 sq．are referred to．

20． $\mathscr{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ к．т．入．Lamb．＇ita ut incontroversa et in promptu posita esset eorum qui imperant prae iis qui sub imperio sunt excellentia＇： Sus．＇dass diese Ueberlegenheit der Herrschenden für die Be－ herrschten（selber）unzweifelhaft und einleuchtend wäre．＇Thus Lamb．takes тoîs ápХонє́vous as in the dat．after ime
 I have not noticed any passage in which the construction assumed by Lamb．occurs，and I incline to follow Sus．，at any rate till a parallel passage is produced．

23．＇̇nei $\delta \underset{\text { è }}{\text { к．т．} \boldsymbol{\lambda} \text { ．，＇but since it is not easy to light on this highly }}$ superior element，and we have not among ourselves anything to
answer to the vast superiority of the kings to their subjects, which Scylax says exists in India.' For $\lambda a \beta \epsilon i v$ in this sense, cp .3 . 15 .

 and Eth. Nic. 10. 3. 1174 a 17. As to toûto, Aristotle often uses the neuter in referring to persons, e.g. in 2. 5. 1263 a I and 3. 13. 1283 b 9. He would seem to have had before him the genuine narrative of Scylax of Caryanda in Caria, as to whom see Hdt. 4. 44. The Periplus which we possess bearing his name is not the genuine work by him, and does not contain the statement here repeated by Aristotle. The testimony of Scylax as to the superiority-both physical and mental, apparently-of the kings in India to their subjects may well have been perfectly true. - Throughout Polynesia the chiefs and upper classes are taller than the lower orders, and with a finer physical they combine a greater mental development. They are in every respect superior to the people whom they rule. They are as genuine an aristocracy as ever existed in any country. They know every plant, animal, rock, river, and mountain, are familiar with their history, legends, and uraditions, and strict in observing every point of their own complicated etiquette. They swim, row, sail, shoot, and fight better than the common people, and excel in house and canoe building' (Seemann, Viti, p. 79). For the form Baбi入éas see note on 1284 b 33 .
25. фavepòv ö ot к..т.入., 'it is clear that it is for many reasons necessary that all should share alike in ruling and being ruled in turn [and that rulers and ruled should be the same persons], for when the sharers are alike, equality demands that each shall have the same share' (i.e. an identity of political privilege), 'and [the constitution must be just, for] it is difficult for a constitution to last which is framed in contravention of what is just.' For tó $\tau \epsilon$ yà $\rho$ đ̈ov raùrò̀ тoîs ó óoiots, cp. 3. 16. 1287 a 12 sqq. and 4 (7). $3 \cdot 1325$ b 7 sq., and also Thuc. 6. 38. 5, кaì $\pi \omega \hat{\omega}$ síkatov $\tau o u ̀ s ~ a u ̀ r o u ̀ s ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$

29. $\mu \in \tau \grave{\alpha} \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т.ג., 'for together with the ruled [citizens] are forthcoming desirous of revolution all those who are scattered over the territory,' i. e. the cultivators and other residents in the country
 $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu$, and 38 , той катà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \chi \dot{\omega} \rho a \nu \nu \lambda \dot{\eta} \theta$ ous). Aristotle has arranged in c . 10.1330 a 25 sqq. that the cultivators shall not be $\theta v \mu 0 \epsilon \mathrm{o}$ êis or
 of revolution, though unable to make a revolution without the help

 slave or serf cultivators of a tendency to $\nu \in \omega \tau \epsilon \rho \iota \sigma \mu$ ós (2.4.1262 a 40 sqq.: 4 (7). 10. 1330 a 28 ).
32. à $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ к.т.入. Cp. 2. 6. 1265 b 18 sqq., and Xen. Cyrop.


34. $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ oův k.T..., 'how then this difference is to exist, and how they are to share [in ruling and being ruled by turns], the lawgiver

35. $\pi \rho o ́ t e \rho o v$, in c. 9.1329 a 2 sqq.
 nished us with the distinction, having made that which is the same in kind itself of two parts, the one younger and the other older.' For Staipectv, see critical note. For a similar acceptance of the guidance of nature, cp. c. 17. 1337 a 1 and 1. 8. 1256 b 7 sqq.: also De



 same in kind,' is meant man.
37. ©̂v toîs $\mu$ è̀ к.т.ג. Cp. Plato, Laws 690 A , кaì трítov ëтı




 remembers the words of the aged Nestor to Agamemnon and Achilles (Hom. Il. I. ${ }^{259}$ ),
 and what Agamemnon says of Achilles in I1. 9. 160,


Plutarch may have the passage before us in his memory in An Seni





 ov̉ס̂eis à $\pi \epsilon \lambda \pi i \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \sigma \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon v o \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ ．I have questioned this in vol．ii． p．xix，but I had not then remarked the resemblance which exists between An Seni，etc．，c．18． 793 A，$\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma$ àp ．．．$\eta$ Oovs，and 5 （8）． 7． 1342 b 20 sqq ．A similar calculation to that of Aristotle probably underlay the distinction drawn by Diocletian between the Augusti and the Caesares，the former being＇elder princes＇and the latter＇rising in their turn to the first rank＇（Gibbon，Decline and Fall，c． 13 ：vol．ii．p．168，ed．18ı2）．

 ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \chi \epsilon \iota \rho \dot{\nu} \nu \omega \nu)$ ．
${ }_{a}{ }^{\mu} \lambda \lambda \omega s \quad \tau \epsilon$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．，＇especially as he may expect to be repaid this contribution［of obedience］，when he has reached the right age．＇ An $\epsilon \rho a v o s$ is a contribution of service or money for which in fairness a return should be forthcoming：cp．Eurip．Suppl． 349 Bothe（ $3^{6} 3$ Dindorf），

кá入入ıotov Épavov סoùs $\gamma$ àp àvtı入á\}utaı


 and Isocr．Plat．§57，where roûtov тòv ${ }^{\epsilon} \rho$ pavov is explained by $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 ढ̈favò（40）．Sus．，followed by Welldon，takes the words to mean＇den Ehrenvorzug zu befehlen＇（＇the honourable privilege of ruling＇）． To me it seems that the＇${ }^{\prime} p a \nu o s$ referred to is rather the contribution of submission to the rule of others which the young citizen makes in his youth and receives from those younger than himself in years of maturity．

42．$\check{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ каì тク̀ $\boldsymbol{\pi} \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon i \alpha \nu$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Rulers and ruled will be the same persons at different ages，so that they will be in a sense the same and in a sense different，and similarly the education given to rulers and ruled will be the same but will be different at different ages，the young learning to be ruled and later on learning through being ruled to rule，so that the education also of rulers and ruled will be in a sense the same and in a sense different．For the late appearance of civat in this sentence，cp． 6 （4）．15．1299 b 29，Є̀ $\downarrow$ Oa
 1285 b 36.
2. $\tau \epsilon \gamma \alpha^{\alpha} \rho$ here is not taken up by kai or any equivalent to kai, a thing which rarely happens (see Eucken, De Partic. Usu, p. I9 sq.), so rarely that Eucken pronounces the passage before us corrupt. Sus. ${ }^{2}$, however, rightly remarks that we have here 'one of the few cases in which $\tau \epsilon \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho=$ "etenim." ' English readers may consult Shilleto's critical note to Demosth. De Fals. Leg. c. $176^{\prime}$ (Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ). Eucken points out that in 8 (6). 4. 1318 b 33, ait

 inasmuch as the last eight words are virtually equivalent to kai


 taken up in $\sigma \nu \mu \beta a i \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$ ס́ $\phi$ абı к.т. .., 673 а 10.
 have been ruled otherwise than a freeman should be ruled, for] rule is, as was shown in the first discussions' (i.e. in 3.4.1277 a 33 sqq. and $3 \cdot 6.1278 \mathrm{~b} 30 \mathrm{sqq}$.), 'in one of its forms for the sake of the ruler and in another for the sake of the ruled, and we say that the former of these is rule such as is exercised by a master over slaves and the latter rule such as is exercised over freemen, [so that the latter is the kind of rule to which it is fitting that the young freeman should submit before ruling].'
5. $\phi \alpha \mu \epsilon v$, in $3 \cdot 4.1277$ a 33 sqq. and 3. 6.1278 b 30 sqq.
 3. 4. 1277 a 33 sqq., for we hear nothing there to the same effect. Aristotle had identified $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta} \alpha \rho \chi \eta$ in that passage with $\dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$

 even service of this kind may become noble if it is rendered for a noble end. What Aristotle would consider a noble end may be gathered from 5 (8). 2. 1 337 b 17 sqq. and 5 (8). 6. 134 Ib 10 sqq. (cp. 3. 4.1277 b 5 sq.). He probably has in his mind among
 $\nu \dot{j} \sigma \epsilon$ 生 of the young Spartans employed in the Crypteia (Plato, Laws 63.3 B sq .). Plato had already recommended his agronomi and their youthful assistants to do the like (Laws 762 E sqq., cp. especially



 Athenians who served as $\pi є \rho i \pi \sigma$ до had more done for them by slaves than Plato and Aristotle approved. Vict. refers to the story of Favonius and Pompey told in Plut. Pomp. c. 73, émei $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ кat







Vict. adds, referring to the siege of Florence in $I_{5}{ }^{29}$, 'Recordor ego, cum premeretur obsidione nostra civitas, hostisque ad portas castra posuisset, universam nostram iuventutem in operibus faciendis muniendaque urbe occupatam fuisse, neque tamen eo tempore quicquam quod nobilitati suae non conveniret gessisse, non enim ob mercedem inde capiendam, sed ob libertatem defendendam id faciebat.'
 also in 3. 18. 1288a 37 sqq., to the full citizen of the 'best State,' who is ex hypothesi capable of ruling, we shall not need to read $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau<\kappa о \hat{u}$ with Rassow and Susemihl. See vol. i. Appendix B. The argument is-since the virtue of a ruling citizen and the virtue of the best man are the same, and in our State the ruled citizen becomes sooner or later a ruler, so that he will need sooner or later to possess the virtue of a good man, the lawgiver must make this the aim of his labours, that the citizens may become good men, and [must seek to ascertain] by means of what pursuits [they may best be made so] and what is the end of the best life. For $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon \varepsilon \tau \epsilon о \nu$

 крıтク̀ข $\pi 0 เ 0 ์ \nu \tau \iota \nu a \pi o เ \eta \sigma \sigma \omega \sigma \iota \nu$. The end of the best life is leisure (c. I5. I334 a II sqq.).
 1260 a 5 sqq ., the two parts of the soul are rò $\lambda$ óyov ${ }^{\epsilon} \chi$ '

 the division of the soul which is mentioned as feasible in Eth. Nic.




 which throws much light on that before us, though kat' aúvó, 17 ('per se,' in contradistinction to $\kappa a \theta^{\prime}$ ส̈ $\tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu:$ cp. Eth. Eud. 7. 12. 1245 b 18, quoted above on 1323 b 24, and Eth. Nic. 2. 3. 1105 a 22 sq., and see Bon. Ind. 290 b 34), means more than $\dot{\epsilon} \nu$ aúrஸ̂,

 Nic. 1. 13. 1102 b 30 ), or, as it is occasionally called in the Politics (see above on 1254 b 8 ), тò $\pi a \theta \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v$. Tò $\theta \rho \in \pi \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \rho o s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \psi v \chi \eta ̄ s ~ i s ~$
 ä $\mu \circ \rho \rho \frac{\nu}{\pi \epsilon} \phi \quad \kappa \kappa \nu$. Aristotle recalls this division of the soul because he wishes to throw light on the relative worth of the virtues connected with each part of the soul, and to show, in opposition to the eulogists of the Lacedaemonian constitution, that the virtues of the rational part have more of the character of ends than those of the other part. For the perfect $\delta$ ı $\eta \rho \eta \tau a t, \mathrm{cp} .3 .9 .1280 \mathrm{a} 17$ and 2. 9. 1269 b i6. For the participle $\delta v \nu a ́ \mu \in \nu o \nu$, see note on 1254 b 23.


 hardly likely that סıaı $\epsilon \tau \notin \neq \nu$ єivaı should be supplied. Cp. 5 (8). 7. 134 I b 32 sq. For the $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ solitarium in тois $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu \nu$ oũ $\omega$ dıat $\rho \circ \hat{v} \sigma \iota \nu$, see above on 1332 a 14, 1262 a 6 , and 1270 a 34.
21. aíì $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. We learn in what sense the appetitive part of the soul exists for the sake of the rational part from Magn. Mor.




 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \sigma v \nu \epsilon \rho \gamma \epsilon i \nu \tau \varphi ̂ ~ \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i o \nu \iota . ~ C p . ~ a l s o ~ M . ~ A n t o n i n . ~ C o m m . ~ 5 . ~ 16, ~$

 $\lambda о \gamma \iota \kappa \alpha{ }^{\text {. }}$. On the far-reaching principle, aiєì tò $\chi$ €îpod toû $\beta \in \lambda \tau i o v o ́ s$ є́ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu \tilde{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \kappa \epsilon \nu$, see vol. i. p. $5^{8}$ sq.
22. каì тои̂то фаvєрòv к.т. $\lambda$. When a principle holds good in reference both to art and to nature, Aristotle is often careful
to point out the fact: e.g. in Meteor. 4. 3. $3^{81}$ a 10 sq., De Part. An. I. 1. 639 b 15 sq., and De Gen. An. 4. 6. 775 a 20 sqq.
24. Sıńp $\quad$ raí t $\delta \iota \times \hat{n}$. Sepulv., Lamb., Schn., Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Welldon, and
 perhaps this is better.



26. $\dot{\sigma}$ aút $\omega$, in the same way as ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s, ~ i . e . ~ i n t o ~ t o ̀ ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o v ~ e ̆ \chi \chi o \nu ~$


тои̂то тò $\mu$ '́pos, i.e. тò $\lambda$ óyò eै $\chi o \nu ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \rho o s ~ к а \theta ’ ~ a u ́ t o ́ . ~$
 Ind. 173 b 30 sqq .
 activities of the soul stand in a corresponding relation to each other.' Three classes of activities are apparently referred to-




 can attain either to all the three activities of the soul or to the two lower ones of the three.' I take the meaning to be, that even if a man can attain only to the activities of the irrational part of the soul and to those of the lower, or practical, section of its rational part, the latter class of activities, being activities of the better part of the two, are more desirable for him than the former. If a man can attain to all three, then of course the activities of the theoretic section of the rational part are the most desirable for him.
29. aíєì $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к.т. $\lambda_{\text {., ' for that }}$ is always most desirable for each man which is the highest to which it is possible for him to attain,' whether it is absolutely the highest or not. See vol. i. p. 60.
30. Tâs ó ßios, 'life as a whole': see above on 1253 b 33. In 40 we have toùs ßious. By $\pi a ̂ s$ ó $\beta i o s$ Aristotle means $\pi a ̂ s ~ o ́ ~ \pi o \lambda \iota t ı k o ̀ s ~$

 1256 a 30 sqq. we have a classification of human life, so far as it is concerned with getting food. For the association of $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \chi o \lambda i a$ and $\pi o \lambda \epsilon \mu \circ s$ and of $\epsilon i \rho \eta \nu \eta$ and $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \dot{\eta}, \mathrm{cp} .4 \mathrm{I}$ sq., c. I5. 1334 a 38 sqq., and Eth. Nic. 10. 7.1177 b 4 sqq.

32．кai т $\hat{\nu}$ тракт $\hat{\nu}$ k．$\tau . \lambda$ ．＇Bonitz brackets єis $\tau \alpha$ in 3 ＇and 33 （Ind． 42 b 26 sqq．and 632 a 29 sq．），but see Vahlen in the Zeitschrift für d．östr．Gymn．1872，p．540＇（Sus．${ }^{2}$ ，p．453）． I have not seen Vahlen＇s article．The construction，if we supply ס！！́p $\quad$ rat，as we must apparently do，is certainly remarkable．For $\tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \rho a \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ we have $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ in 40.


 as if âảvá $\gamma \kappa \eta$ ó $\mu$ oíws aip $\epsilon \tau a ̀$ єivau had preceded in 33，and not $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\omega} \dot{\omega} \nu$
 628 D sq．（referred to by Eaton）and 803 D．Cp．（with Eaton）



ảoxo入iav $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \eta ̂ s$ ．See last note．There was much to suggest the view that $\sigma \chi o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ is a nobler thing than $\dot{a} \sigma \chi \circ \lambda i a$ in the Greek conception of the gods as $\rho \in i a$ 广由outes，and in Aristotle＇s own conception of the life of the Deity（see above on 1325 b 28），to say nothing of the close connexion which the Greeks held to exist between $\sigma \chi o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ and $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon p i a$（Plato，Theaet． 175 D ）and between $\sigma^{\chi}{ }^{\circ} \lambda \eta$ and culture（Isocr．Busir．§ 2 I sq．：Metaph．A．I． 98 I b 20 sqq．）．As has often been pointed out by others，Aristotle does not mean idleness or recreation by $\sigma \chi o \lambda \eta$ ．$\quad \Sigma \chi o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ is marked off by him both from à áo入ía and from $\pi a \iota \delta i a ́$ or àvámavoıs：it is not，like $\pi a \iota \delta \alpha^{\prime}$ and àváтavaıs，recreation after toil（5（8）．3．I 337 b 37 sqq．： 5 （8）． 5.1339 b 36 sqq．），nor is it，like áoxodia，the doing of work which is done not for its own sake，but as a means to something else；it is employment in work desirable for its own sake－the hearing of noble music and no doubt also of noble poetry，inter－ course with friends chosen for their worth（Eth．Nic．9．II．117 I b 12 sqq．），and above all the exercise，in company or otherwise，of the speculative faculty．＇A $\sigma \chi o \lambda i a$ and the $\pi a \iota \delta \iota a ́$ or àvámavoıs which makes $\dot{\omega} \sigma \chi^{\omega} \lambda i a$ possible must necessarily find a place in human life， for men cannot exist without them，but the noblest element in human life is $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \dot{\eta}$ ，and it is the end for which work and recreation exist．We hardly know whether Aristotle would class the sight of noble pictures or statues with the hearing of noble music and poetry as a right use of $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \eta$ ：he would probably not regard in this light the exercise of an art even for its own sake． Many will differ from him here，and some may ask whether work
done as a means to something else is not often as desirable for its own sake as anything which could be brought under the head of $\sigma$ रod $\eta$. May we not say this of work done in a noble cause, like that of the victors of Marathon and Salamis, or that of Pitt and Stein, when they 'weathered the storm'? It should be noticed that while Aristotle is following in the track of Plato when he exalts peace above war, he is not a borrower from Plato in his exaltation of $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \eta$ at the expense of $\dot{a} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda i a$. His view of human life as comprising in its best form $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \chi o \lambda i a$, $\pi a \iota \delta o a^{a}$, and $\sigma \chi o \lambda \hat{\eta}$ is a remarkable one, and I am not aware that he owes it to any one.



 סéovtal đaıঠeías. According to the common view (a different view is ascribed to Pythagoras in Diog. Laert. 8. Io), boyhood ceased at



 madocias seem to imply that education in the 'best State' will extend over more $\dot{\eta} \lambda_{\text {triat }}$ than the two represented by boyhood and the years from puberty to twenty-one (see note on 1336 b 37).
5. oi $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ vûv äpıoтa к.т..入. The Lacedaemonians and Cretans are especially referred to (cp. 12 sqq. and c. 2.1324 b 7 sqq.: see also note on 1337 a 31). Plato had said much the same in Laws 628 C sqq. Are we to infer from the use of kai in II, kai
 monian and Cretan lawgivers as the authors of written constitutions and laws? Aristotle turns aside to censure the Lacedaemonian training in 5 (8). 4. r 338 b 9 sqq. also. The Fourth and Fifth Books of the Politics are written in a strongly anti-Laconian spirit. The Lacedaemonian lawgiver is more severely criticized in them than he is in the Second. It is true that the Spartans are said in the Second Book (c.9.1271 b 9) to prefer external goods to virtue -a strong thing to say of men who prided themselves on their virtue ( 4 ( 7 ). II. 1330 b $3^{2}$ )-but this fault is not explicitly traced back to the lawgiver. In the Fourth Book, on the other hand (c. 2. 1324 b 27 sq.), the lawgiver is charged with pursuing an
unlawful end ; it is also implied in $13^{2} 5$ a 7 sqq. (cp. c. 14. 1333b 23) that he was not a good lawgiver (contrast 6 (4). II. 1296 a 18-21). Aristotle's criticisms of the Lacedaemonian lawgiver throughout the Fourth and Fifth Books are, in fact, more in the spirit of those of Isocrates (see e.g. Panath. § 210 sqq.) than of those of Plato.
6. $\tau$ uútas $=\tau a ̀ s ~ \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu . ~ C p . ~ 7(5) .9 . ~ 1309 ~ b ~ 40, ~ a n d ~ s e e ~ n o t e ~$ on 1276 a 14 .
 have neither framed their constitutional arrangements with a view to the better end,' etc. Пןòs тò $\beta \dot{\epsilon} \lambda \tau i o \nu \tau \in \lambda o s ~ a n s w e r s ~ t o ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \omega ~$ кaì тà тé̉ $\eta$, 1333 a 39 , and $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi a ́ \sigma a s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a ̉ ~ \rho \epsilon \tau a ́ s, ~ 8, ~ t o ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi a ́ v \tau a, ~$ r333a 36. The 'better end' is leisure and peace and things noble.

$\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ фортıкติs $\alpha \pi$ ék $\lambda \iota v a v$ к.т. $\lambda$. We have been told in 1333 a $3^{6}$ that things noble are to be preferred to things necessary and useful. Compare the very similar sentence in De Part. An. I. 1. 642 a 28,


 ả $\nu \delta \rho \epsilon i a \nu ~ \tau \iota \mu \hat{\omega} \sigma \iota \nu$ ai $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon s$, oủ $\beta \epsilon \lambda \tau i \sigma \tau \eta \nu$ ov̉ $\sigma a \nu$ т $\omega \hat{\nu}$ ả $\rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu ; ~ \hat{\eta}$ öтt




 Ө́poos (5 (8). 3. 1338 b 2). The Spartans valued themselves on
 (Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 1. 246: 2. 393)—and when Aristotle hints here that their lawgiver was фортıкós, and in 5 (8). 4. $133^{8} \mathrm{~b} 3^{2}$ sqq. that his famous training made them Bávavoot, he says as severe a thing as it was possible for him to say. In $\pi \lambda \epsilon 0 \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau \iota \kappa \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho a s$ Aristotle echoes Plato, Laches 182 E , ois (i.e.

 $\pi \dot{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon \mu \nu=$ cp. also Isocr. Panath. § 188 and Plut. Lycurg. c. 28, є̇v




11．тарат入ךбíفs тoútots．I do not think that Aristotle means by these words фортıкติs．Cp．Meteor．1．6． 342 b 35，таратл $\eta \sigma i \omega s$
 גंтєфض̆ทаขто．

14．${ }^{\circ}$ ，＇which praises．＇
16．$\dot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к．т．$\lambda ., ~ ' f o r ~ j u s t ~ i n ~ t h e ~ s a m e ~ s p i r i t ~ i n ~ w h i c h, ' ~ e t c . ~$ Thibron＇s grounds of praise are those of oi $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i$, and are therefore sordid and easily overthrown by reasoning．Oi $\pi o \lambda \lambda o i$ are athirst




 కŋ入оû̀тєs．
 iлєpox $\bar{\eta}$ à $y a \theta \dot{a}$ ，such as high birth，wealth，and political power： cp ． Eth．Nic．4．8． 1124 a 20 sqq．

ảץá $\mu \in \nu=s$ фaivetaı，＇evidently admires．＇There is perhaps a reference to Thibron in Isocr．Panath．§ 4 I ，$\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \Sigma \pi a \rho \tau \iota a \tau \omega ิ \nu$（ $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ ），
 $\pi \epsilon \pi \circ \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon \nu \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu \mu \epsilon ́ \mu \nu \eta \nu \tau a \iota \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath}$ av̉т $\omega$ ．As to the other writers on the Lacedaemonian Constitution，see above on 1269 a 29.

20．ö $\boldsymbol{\tau \iota}$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．，＇because it was owing to their having been trained to meet dangers that they ruled over many，＇and thus they owed their empire to their lawgiver．Гvuvá $\xi \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ is not used exclusively of gymnastic training（cp．for instance 2．12． 1274 a 26 ），but the gymnastic training enforced by the Lacedaemonian lawgiver（5（8）． 4． 1338 b 27 sqq．）is probably here referred to，for it was supposed at Sparta to produce courage（ $\mathrm{r} 33^{8} \mathrm{~b}$ I2 sqq．）．The notion that $\gamma v \mu \nu a ́ \sigma \iota a$ lead to ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ ảp $\chi a i$ occurs also in Plato，Protag． $354 \mathrm{~A}-\mathrm{B}$ （cp． $342 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{C}$ ）．

23．є̈тı $\delta \stackrel{\text { è }}{\text { к．т．} \lambda \text { ．The sense is－besides it is not merely that }}$ they have lost noble living，but that they have lost it，notwith－ standing that（as they claim）they have faithfully observed the laws given them by their lawgiver and there has been nothing to hinder them from doing so；this is indeed strange．Aristotle hints that either the fault must rest with the lawgiver or the Spartans had not really observed his laws．Iє $\begin{gathered}\text { oion has much the same }\end{gathered}$ meaning here as äтото⿱（cp．Phys．7．3． 246 а 25 ．ёть каı̆ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \mathrm{s}$

 Damasc. Fragm. 57 (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 3. 390 : cp. Diod. 7. 14. 7),
 present to Aristotle's memory. In Isocr. Archid. § 6 r the Lacedaemonian King Archidamus claims that the Spartans had abided by the laws which had been given them ; there were, however, two views on this subject (see Isocr. De Pace, § 102 and above on
 тò $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma$ eat rois vó óous to the fact that the observance of Solon's laws at Athens had been interrupted by the Tyranny ('AO. Под, c. 22).




 monian lawgiver were right in praising him for making rule over other States his end, the kind of rule-despotic rule-which they praise him for honouring is not the kind of rule which a lawgiver should be seen to honour. Cp. c. 2. 1324 b 26 sqq ., and for $\tau \mu \omega \hat{\omega} \tau a$


27. тoû yàp к.т.入. Cp. c. 3 . 1325 a 24 sqq.
29. Ëт兀 $\delta \stackrel{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon}$ к.т.... Further, they praise the lawgiver not only for what brings no permanent happiness, but also for what is positively harmful.
 to conquer with a view to ruling over others.' I have not met with an instance of $\mathfrak{a} \sigma \kappa \epsilon \hat{i} \nu$ used with an acc. of the person and an infinitive, unless we except the passage of Photius quoted below on 1337 a I, but Plutarch has in De Defect. Orac. c. 21 $\gamma^{\lambda} \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma a u s ~ \delta \dot{\epsilon}$
 Conquering is the first step to ruling over others: cp. c. 2. 1324 b 27 sq., and 1324 b 7 sqq., and also Plut. Lycurg. et Num. inter se


32. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ ov $\gamma$ àp öтı к.т.ג. A shrewd remark and one which, so far as I know, Aristotle was the first to make. There is much in the history of ancient Rome and modern France to illustrate and


charge Pausanias their king with doing, notwithstanding that he was already the holder of so great an office.' The Lacedaemonians praise their lawgiver for teaching the State to do to other States the very thing which they censure Pausanias for trying to do to his fellow-citizens. Aristotle has usually been taken to refer here and

 however, describes in 7 (5). 7 . 1307 a 2 sqq. as ó $\sigma$ т $\rho a \tau \eta \gamma \dot{\eta}$ бas кат̀̀

 guardian of King Pleistarchus, who was a minor (cp. Hdt. 9. 1o and Thuc. r. I32, referred to by Eaton), but he is 'often loosely called king in the later writers, e. g. in [Demosth.] c. Neaer. c. 97 : Duris, Fragm. $3^{1}$ (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 2. 477), ap. Athen. Deipn. 535 e: Justin 9. I' (Busolt, Gr. Gesch. 2. 380. 4, ed. 1), and Aristotle may be guilty of a similar looseness here. In the second edition, however, of his Griechische Geschichte ( $\mathrm{I} .5^{\mathrm{I}} 3$ and note 3, and 3. I. 98. I) Busolt, following E. Meyer, takes the reference here and in 7 (5). ․ r 30 r b 20 to be to the king Pausanias who was an opponent of Lysander. This Pausanias was really king, and might well be contrasted as such with ó $\sigma \tau \rho a \tau \eta \gamma \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a s$ кãà | òv |
| :---: |
| $\mathrm{M} \eta \delta i \kappa o ̀ \nu$ | $\pi \delta \bar{\alpha} \epsilon \mu \nu \nu$, but see on the other side of the question Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 22. 2. Was the opponent of Lysander quite the man to entertain the hardy design of abolishing the ephorate and making himself master of the State?

35. по入ıтıкós. Cp. c. 2. 1324 b 26 sq.
36. $\lambda$ óy $\begin{aligned} \\ \text {, i.e. praises of the lawgiver for his training his citizens }\end{aligned}$ to conquer with a view to empire.
 and c. 3.1325 b 30 sqq . The 'best things' to which Aristotle refers appear to be temperance, justice, and wisdom in contradistinction to a capacity to conquer one's neighbours.
 of the true aim of war, vol. i. p. $3^{2} 7$ sq. Aristotle evidently has






37. iva is here followed by öncos. See Weber, Die Absichtssätze bei Aristoteles, p. 18 sqq., who gives a long list of passages in Aristotle's writings in which the same thing occurs, among them Pol. 2. 7. 1267 a 2 sqq., 7 (5). 1. 13о в $6-17$, and 8 (6). 5. 1320 b II sqq. Kaissling (Tempora und Modi in des Aristoteles Politica und in der Atheniensium Politia, p. $3^{2}$ ) compares ' $A \theta$. Под. c. 16. 1. 7 sqq.


 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \check{\text { ëraбтò (Bon. Ind. } 149 \mathrm{~b} \text { ro). }}$

38. тás̀n. See above on 1260 a 36 .
39. ai $\gamma$ à $\pi \lambda \epsilon \hat{\epsilon} \sigma \tau a \iota$ к.т.入. Cp. 2. 9. 127 I b 3 sqq.
 war their end.
 Plato, Rep. 430 A . Baф́n here means the temper which is produced by dipping, rather than the dipping itself. In Plut. De Vitioso

 with Isocrates (De Pace, § 95 sqq.), that when the Peloponnesian War came to an end and the Lacedaemonians found themselves at the head of an empire, they lost much of the justice and temperance which war had enforced on them and became ißpıtrai (28) and




 dwells on their insolent treatment of the Chians ( $\S 98$ ) and of the islands generally ( $\$ 99$ ). He ascribes this change in them to their possession of maritime empire, which had already demoralized Athens, whereas Aristotle ascribes it to defective education and to the effect of leisure. The Lacedaemonian training was a training only for war ; it did not impart justice and temperance, still less did it impart intellectual virtue. If this had been otherwise, the Lacedaemonians would have spent their leisure in pursuits which would have prevented the loss of 'temper' to which Aristotle refers. So Plato (Rep. 549 B) says of them that they lacked the

 of the Thebans in Fragm． 67 （Müller，Fr．Hist．Gr．1．254）．See above on 127 I b 4 ．

11．＇Eтєi ठє̀ к．т．ג．Cp．c． 3 ． $133^{2} 5$ b 30 sqq．and c．14．1333 b 37．C． 15. The end is $\sigma \chi o \lambda \dot{\eta}$ ，as is explained in 14 sqq．

12．öpor，＇distinctive aim＇（＝тé̉os，II）：cp．c．2．I 324 b 3 sqq．

14．Tàs єís tìv $\sigma$ Xo

 That the best man will possess the capacity of using leisure aright， we have seen in c．14．I333 a 41 sqq．

15．то入入ákıs，e．g．in c．I4．I 333 a 35.

 of leisure in occupations desirable for their own sake－such occu－ pations as have been described above on 1333 a 35 ．See as to its nature，Zeller，Gr．Ph．2．2．735．5（Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics，Eng．Trans．，2．266．5），and Sus．${ }^{2}$ ，Note 921 （Sus．${ }^{4}$ ， 1．p． $54^{2}$ ）．It is closely related to the end of human life（ 5 （8）． 5 ． 1339 a 29－3x），and therefore to happiness（ 1339 b $17-19$ ），and hence，like happiness，it combines in itself both the pleasurable and the noble．

 the possession of an abundance of necessaries，because it excludes the spendthrift habits of life which are a common concomitant of its opposite：cp．Eth．Nic．4．3．II2I b 7，סıò kaì àkó入aбтoı aủt $\hat{\nu} \nu$

 $\dot{a} \pi o \kappa \lambda i v o v a \iota v$. It is implied that courage and other military virtues are productive of wealth in c．14． $1333 \mathrm{~b} 10, \mathrm{r} 6 \mathrm{sqq}$ ．：cp．also

 servative of wealth is obvious．

20．катà $\gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \pi a \rho o t \mu i ́ \alpha v, ~ o u ̉ ~ \sigma x o \lambda \grave{\eta}$ Soúdors．See Leutsch and Schneidewin，Paroem．Gr．2． 765 ，where a remark of Erasmus is quoted，＇dicitur in eos quibus propter obnoxiam ministeriis sordi－ dioribus conditionem non vacat honestis disciplinis operam dare．＇

The proverb seems to be remembered by Euripides in a fragment of the Antiope (Fr. 215 ),



 on 13 r3b 18). So we read in Plut. Cato Censor, c. 21, of Cato's
 Compare also the saying ascribed to Socrates, $\dot{\eta}$ 'Apyia adeci $\phi \dot{\eta}$ Tiेs 'Eגev $\begin{aligned} & \text { épias è́cti (Aelian, Var. Hist. 10. 14). }\end{aligned}$
 10, and Isocr. Archid. § 7.
 leisure.' Bonitz (Ind. 82 I a 6 ) rightly explains фìoooфía here as $=$ 'virtus intellectualis.' See above on 1263 b 40 . In 5 (8). 5. 1339 a 26 we find фpór $\quad$ ors used in the sense of 'intellectual virtue' (see Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 1023 : Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. $5^{85}$ ). We do not learn in the Fifth Book how Aristotle proposes to develope intellectual virtue by his education; yet he keeps its development in view even in his arrangements respecting musical training; thus one reason why he
 סóávotav (5 (8). 6. 134 I b 6 ).


 temperance by means of the musical element in his education (5 (8). 5. $1340 \mathrm{a} 18 \mathrm{sqq}$. ) and possibly justice also (cp. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \bar{\eta} \theta \iota \kappa \bar{\omega} \nu$, 1340a21). Something, however, would have been done for the promotion of temperance even in childhood by careful attention to children's pastimes and to the tales told them, and by the prohibition of objectionable language in their presence, etc.
 temperate,' so that in time of war men act justly and temperately, whether they have these virtues or not. 'Avayká̧et is emphatic.
 $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \tau i \theta \eta \sigma \iota \sigma \omega \phi \rho \sigma \nu \epsilon i v$, and for the thought Xen. Cyrop. 8. 4. 14, סoкєi

 $\dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi о \iota \in i$.






 Paroem. Gr. 1. 266). See also Justin 8. 1. 4. It would be easy to multiply instances of this familiar saying. For $\tau \grave{̀} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda a ́ s \in \epsilon \nu \mu \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ єip пооо̂̀ral. For $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda$ ov, see note on 127 O b 33 .
 cum Camerario [Interp. p. 319] Victorius; poetarum Atticorum exempla posuit Porson ad Euripidis Orestem versu 659, prosaicorum scriptorum locum praeter hunc adhuc alium similem nondum reperi.' See Kühner, Ausführl. gr. Gramm., ed. 2, § 409. 4. Anm. 5,
 to among other passages from the poets. It is possible that $\mu \epsilon \tau \in \varrho \in \epsilon \nu$ has dropped out (cp. 35).
 ${ }_{2} 5$ sqq. and Plato, Laws 631 B. The possession of all possible goods was held to make men insolent and overbearing (Rhet. 2. i6. 1390 b 32 sqq.). ' $\mathrm{E} \nu \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \nu$ à $\gamma a \theta 0 i$ is was a familiar Greek expression: cp. Bergk, Fragm. Adesp. Lyr. 18,
 and see Leutsch and Schneidewin's note on Gregor. Cypr. I. $3^{6}$ (Paroem. Gr. 2. 58). It is parodied in Aristoph. Acharn. 1025 Didot,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { ढ่้ } \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota \text { ßo入írots, }
\end{aligned}
$$

and Vesp. 709 Didot,

 points out (Interp. p. 319), speaks of the Elysian plain; it is from Hesiod, Op. et Dies, 170 sqq., that we first hear of the Islands of the Blest. See Liddell and Scott s.v. $\mu$ ákap. Hesiod describes how some favoured heroes of the fourth race did not die like their fellows, but were removed by Zeus far from the haunts of men to the Islands of the Blest in the deep-eddying Ocean. Even in the later Iron Age there were those whose lot was thought to be the same-e.g. Harmodius (Bergk, Poet. Lyr. Gr. Scol. ro) and those
who were initiated in the Eleusinian mysteries (Diog. Laert. 6. 39).
 Rhodes, the realm of Macareus (Diod. 5. 82), but they were more commonly believed to lie in the Atlantic Ocean at some distance from the West Coast of Libya (Plut. Sertor, c. 8: cp. Hor. Epod. 16. 41 sqq.).
32. фidoooфias is introduced at some cost of trimness, but this is Aristotle's way: see note on 1323 b 35 .
34. $\mu \grave{\mathrm{c}} \boldsymbol{\mathrm { v }}$ oủv has no $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ to answer to it, as the text stands. Perhaps it was taken up by another $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ oủv in the lacuna which, as we shall see, probably exists in 1334 b 4, both being then answered by $\pi \hat{\omega} s$


38. aioxpoû $\gamma$ ̀̀p ôvros к.т.ג., 'for [if they have them not, they will not be able to use good things in leisure-time, and] while it is disgraceful,' etc. Leisure is the crown of life, and $\dot{\eta}$ हो $\begin{gathered}\tau \hat{\eta} \\ \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{\eta}\end{gathered}$
 it is especially desirable to be able to make a right use of good things in leisure-time. Cp. also Eth. Nic. 2. 2. 1105 a 9, $\pi \epsilon \rho \mathrm{i}$ ©̀̀ rò






 $\tau \bar{\eta} s \pi o \lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \bar{\eta} s$. Contrast the language of Xenophon in Rep. Lac.



41. ékeîvor $\mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu$ yàp к.т.... The meaning is -for they do not differ from other men in their views with regard to the question what are the greatest goods: the common herd think that external goods are the greatest of goods (Eth. Nic. 9. 8. 1168 b 1 7, тои́т $\omega \nu$

 '́ $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ), and so do the Lacedaemonians (Pol. 2. 9. 127 I b 6 sqq.) ; it is only in this that they differ from the mass of men, that they hold these goods to be won by means of one of the virtues (courage or military virtue). So far we see our way clearly, but there is little
doubt that the sentence which follows, commencing with $\overline{\epsilon \pi} \pi i \quad \delta \epsilon$, has reached us in an imperfect state, and that several words have dropped out after $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ dं $\rho \in \epsilon \hat{\omega} \nu$, I 334 b 4-how many, it is impossible to say. The lost words may well have ended with the word $\dot{a} \rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$, and the omission of them may well have been due to the resemblance of $\dot{a} \rho \epsilon \tau \bar{\eta} \nu$ to $\grave{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\omega} \nu, \mathrm{r} 334 \mathrm{~b} 4$. Many attempts have been made to fill the lacuna (see Sus. ${ }^{3}$ on the passage), but with indifferent success. If I were to hazard a suggestion, it would be to insert after à $\rho \epsilon \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$

 at any rate that this filling-up more or less represents the sense of the words which have fallen out. Compare with the passage before us 2. 9. 127 I a 4 I -b 10 . Camerarius (Interp. p. 320) was the first to suggest 'locum mendis non carere.' For oú тaútn $\delta$ ठaф́́povor $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ä̀ $\lambda \omega \nu$, cp. Poet. 5. 1 449 b io sqq. (already compared by Vahlen, Beitr. zu Aristot. Poet. 3. 327), and Xen. Cyrop. 8. 2.
 $\delta \iota a \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \nu \mu \circ \iota \delta o \kappa \omega ิ ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \tau \omega \nu$ öт८ к.т.入. For $\tau a u ́ \tau \eta$ referring to what follows Bonitz (Ind. 546 b iI) compares Poet. 23. 1459 a 30 sqq.
 as Vict. points out. Possibly rivédar should be read (with Schn. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ and Sus.) in place of $\gamma \epsilon \nu \dot{\prime} \epsilon \theta a t:$ cp. 2.9 .1271 b 7 , where we have yive $^{\prime} \theta a a$. Taùra, $1334 \mathrm{~b} 2,3=\tau \dot{a} \gamma a \not a ̀ ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \mu \dot{\alpha} \chi \eta \tau a$. For the thought, cp. Xen. Cyrop. 3. 3. 8.
 to be practised for the sake of the happiness resulting from it; what he objects to is the practice of virtue for the sake of $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ $\pi \in \rho ц а ́ \chi \eta \tau a$ àqaAá.

 Rhet. 2. 18. 1391 r 22, and for $\pi \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$ ধ̈́rat, Pol. 4 (7). 14. 1332 b 34 ,

 sqq. Toûro $\delta \dot{\eta}$, as in c. 14. $133^{2}$ b i3.
 elsewhere (see note on 1252 a 24), introduces an investigation. $\Delta \imath \eta \rho \eta \mu$ evor is middle and used in the sense of סıopisistv (cp. 3. 14.

7. тoút $\omega$, ' of these things,' a partitive genitive : cp. c. II. r330 a

8. тро́тєроу, in c. 7 .
9. $\tau \alpha \hat{\tau} \tau \alpha \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. explains why this question must be considered: we must ask whether training through habit should precede training through reason, because these two kinds of training must be so harmonized with each other as to be adjusted to the best end, and we shall be better able to adjust them to the best end when this question has been answered. Aristotle has already said (c. 13. ${ }^{1} 33^{2}$ b 5) that nature, habit, and reason must harmonize with each other; he now adds that they must be so harmonized as to be adjusted to the best end. He follows in the track of Plato, Laws 653 B and 659 D. At Sparta this best kind of harmony had been missed, for in the Lacedaemonian training nature and habit had not been brought into harmony with reason, nor had reason been adjusted to the best end.
11. каí, 'both.'








фavepòv $\delta \dot{\eta}$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle is about to decide that training through habit must precede training through reason, but that training through habit must be adjusted to and pursued for the sake of reason, which is the end, and he proves the second proposition first (in $12-17$ ) and then the first (in $17-25$ ). Trans-late-'this then at any rate is evident, first that as in all other things, [so in the case of the human being,] generation starts from a beginning, and that the end of some beginnings is related to another end, and that reason and thought are the end of man's natural development, so that [reason and thought are the end of generation, and] it is with a view to these ends that we should order generation and our training in custom.' I follow Sepulveda, Vict., Lamb., Stahr, and Welldon in my rendering of $\dot{\omega}$ s $\dot{\eta}$ үévéıs $\grave{a} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ à $\rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ '̇ $\sigma \tau i . \quad$ Sus. ${ }^{2}$ (cp. Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. 545) translates 'dass die Erzeugung und Geburt den Anfang macht (für den man zu sorgen hat)'-i.e. 'that generation and birth are the beginning (for which we have to care)'-comparing c. 16. 1334 b 29, but

 It has not, I think, been noticed that Aristotle has before

 àv $\epsilon \xi$ à $\rho \chi \eta$ गेs $\gamma$ íyvouto, which supports the interpretation adopted by me. With Sepulveda (p. 237 b) I take the 'beginning' from which generation 'starts' to be the union of the parents: cp. Plato,


 c. 16. I334 b 29-3x, where it is implied that $\dot{\eta} \sigma \dot{v} \zeta \epsilon v \xi \iota s$ is the $\dot{a} \rho \chi \eta{ }_{\eta}$ $\tau \hat{\eta} s \gamma^{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \epsilon \omega s$. Compare with the passage before us those quoted in vol. i. p. 348, note 2, and Metaph. Ө. 8. I050 a 7 sqq. Aristotle's aim is that in all arrangements connected with the generation of his future citizens and with the training of habit given them the ultimate development of reason and thought shall be kept in view, and we find that he bears this in mind later on (see above on 1334 a 23 , and cp. c. 16 . $1335 \mathrm{~b} \times 6$ sqq., 29 sqq., and 5 (8). 6. r34I a 24 sq., b 6 sqq.). We expect тò $\tau \grave{\lambda} \lambda$ os tò

 Sıкабтпрív. See also below on 1336 a 4 I and cp . Plato, Laws



 soul is said to consist є́k 入óyov кai ỏ ó́ $\xi \in \omega$ s, and De An. 3. 10. 433 а 9,

 soul and $\nu o$ v̂s to the rational, is implied in $1.5 .1254 \mathrm{~b} 5-9$, but we are not told elsewhere, so far as I am aware, that ${ }^{\circ} \rho \epsilon \epsilon \epsilon \iota s$ is the ${ }^{\prime \prime} \xi t s$ of the one part of the soul and $\nu o$ ôs of the other. For the meaning of


 39, where an ${ }^{\text {Ë }} \xi$ ıs has been said to be a more permanent state than
 $\hat{\eta} \nu$ тò ä̉
 $\lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \theta v \mu i a$, for ${ }^{\circ} \rho \in \epsilon \in \iota$ is made up of these three things (De


 ＇Aristotle＇s language is not uniform，＇for he connects $\beta$ oúd $\eta \sigma$ Is，not with the irrational，but with the rational part of the soul in De An．

 4．III b ig sqq．Aristotle evidently regards infants as having wishes which are not $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t$ tvpiau，and yet which belong wholly to the irrational part of the soul．One difference between èmitvuia and及ovinjots is that the former is always felt in relation to that which is possible，and that this is not always the case with the latter （IIII b 22）．

22．$\theta u \mu \grave{s}$ र yàp к．т．入．Here Aristotle，as Eaton has already pointed out，follows in the track of Plato，Rep． 44 I A，кaì yàp év


 Probl．30．5． 955 b 22 ：and the fragment of Philemon quoted above on 1332 b io．Aristotle may perhaps regard $\theta v \mu o ́ s, ~ \beta o u ́ \lambda \eta \sigma \iota s$, and $\dot{\epsilon} \pi t \theta v \mu i a$ as closely connected with the body：cp．Virg．Aen． 6. 730 sqq．






24．ò Sè $\lambda_{\text {oyøopòs kai ó voûs к．т．入．The expression comes to }}$ Aristotle from Plato，Rep． 586 C ，$\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \nu \nu \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \mu \eta \eta_{s} \tau \epsilon$ каì vikns каіे
 Laws 897 C ）．These are the faculties that control ö $\rho \in \xi$ 纤（Eth． Nic．7．8． 1150 b 22 sqq．）and bring it within bounds．They are absent in other animals than man（De An．3．10． 433 a Ir sq．）， and the child has them in an imperfect form（Pol．I．13．1260a 13）．At what age they develope we are not told．According to Probl． 30.5 ． 955 b 22 sqq．voûs increases in men as they grow older，and reaches its highest development in old age（è $\pi \grave{\imath}$ ríposs）． Some further light is thrown on the subject by Plato，Symp．




$\pi \rho o i ̈ o u ̂ \sigma i v . ~ B o n i t z ~(I n d . ~ s . v) ~ c o m p a r e s ~ D e ~ P a r. t . ~ A n . ~ 4 . ~ i o . ~$


 such word. See note on 1279 b 7 .
 so trained as to obey עuỗ (1. 5. 1254 b 5: see note on 1333 a 2 1, and cp. Plato, Laws $\left.653 \mathrm{~B}, 6_{59} \mathrm{D}\right)$.





 of $\tilde{\nu} \nu \in \kappa \alpha$ with $\tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s$ Eucken remarks (Praepositionen, p. 20), 'if $\tilde{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon K a$ belongs to two notions, it is usually expressed only with the first, and must be supplied with the second.'

29 sqq. Cp. Plato, Laws 72 I A. But Aristotle is less guided C. 16. by Plato in this chapter than he is in the seventeenth. He raises questions here which Plato had not raised and solves those which Plato had already raised in a different way. Plato had not inquired
 had he discussed the proper season of the year for marriage or the other questions raised in 1335 a 39 sqq. 'A $\pi^{\prime}$ ả $\rho \chi \eta \eta^{\prime}$ is evidently equivalent to $\dot{a} \pi \dot{\partial} \tau \hat{\eta} s \sigma v \zeta \epsilon \dot{v} \xi \in \omega s$.
30. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \rho \in ф о \mu \epsilon \in \nu \omega \nu$, 'of the children in process of rearing,' for not all that are born are to be reared. So Sepulv., whom Vict. follows.
$\pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau о \nu \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda .$, 'attention must first be given to the coupling of man and wife in marriage, [and the question must be considered] when'-i.e. at what age-' and in what condition [of body and mind] they should enter upon matrimonial intercourse with each other.' Critias, following no doubt Lacedacmonian traditions, had already said the same thing (see vol. i. p. 350, note r). On the other hand, 'Chrysippus is reproached by Posidonius (Galen, Hipp. et Plat. 5. I) for neglecting the first germs of education in his treatise on the subject, particularly those previous to birth ' (Zeller, Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics, Eng. Trans., p. 3०3, note 2). In
relation to animals other than man nature herself had fixed the age and season of the year at which intercourse was to take place
 $\dot{\omega} \rho \iota \tau \mu \dot{\epsilon} v a \imath \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \zeta \dot{\varphi} \omega \nu)$, and Aristotle follows in her track. Indeed, Greek custom seems to have prescribed a certain season of the year for marriage (c. 16. 1335 a 36 sqq.), and particular Greek States seem often to have had an age of their own for its celebration (c. 16.1335 a $\mathbf{r}_{5}$ sqq.). Another point is recognized in 1335 b
 $\pi \rho o े s ~ \tau \epsilon \kappa \nu o \pi o t i a \nu$. It is not likely that regulations on this subject existed in any Greek State. Пр̂̂тov $\mu$ év has nothing strictly answering to it, but it is in effect taken up by c. 17. 1336 a 3 ,

 question тórє к.т.... is considered in 1334 b $3^{2-1} 335$ a 35 , and the question roiovs tuvàs b̈vtas к.т..入. is considered, so far as relates to the body, in 1335 b $2-12$.
 this union should look both to the persons united [as distinguished from the children to be born] and to the [whole] time for which they will live [not merely to the time at which the union takes place], in order that they may arrive simultaneously in respect of age at the same epoch' (i. e. the epoch at which each of the two
 and for $\sigma v \gamma к а a \beta \beta a i v \omega \sigma \iota 1335$ а 10 sq., $3^{1}$ ). If the lawgiver looked merely to the time at which the union takes place, and did not look forward to the time at which the power to have children is lost by husband and wife respectively, he might very well be led to arrange that husband and wife should both be of the same age and young, but to do this would be an error, and the right course for him is to keep in view the whole course of the lives of the wedded pair and to arrange that the husband shall be twenty years or so older than his wife. For tò̀ toù $\zeta \tilde{\eta} \nu$ र $\rho$ óvov, cp. Plut. Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum, c. 17. 1098 E,


 Gr. 4. 490),



Philemon, "Eфnßos Fragm. I (Meineke 4. ro),

> oủk єis $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \in \rho a \nu$
> $\chi є \iota \mu u ́ \zeta о \mu a \iota ~ \mu i a \nu ~ \gamma i ́ \rho, ~ \epsilon i s ~ т o ̀ ~ \zeta \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \delta ~ \delta ~ o ̈ \lambda o \nu: ~$
and Dittenberger, Syll. Inscr. Gr. No. 444, Пıтúגos Пoбєıঠímaov тòv
 Х fóvov. Camerarius (Interp. p. 323) rightly translates $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu ~ \tau o v ̂ ~ \zeta \eta ̄ \nu$ $\chi$ о́óv ${ }^{\text {' }}$ vitae ipsius spacium.' Susemihl's rendering of the sentence, which Mr. Welldon follows, translating ' he should have in view not only the persons themselves who are to marry but their time of life,' needs the support of parallel instances of this use of tò $\tau$ rov $\zeta \eta{ }^{\eta} \nu \quad \chi$ póvov. Aristotle follows in the track of Euripides (Fragm. 24 : cp. Fragm. 906, and contrast Fragm. 319, quoted below on 1335 a 1),




 $\sigma \dot{v} \zeta \epsilon v \xi \iota \nu$, we see from 1335 a 35 sqq . The union of man and wife
 1252 b 9 sq.
37. каì $\sigma$ тá $\sigma \epsilon \iota s ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda \eta ́ \lambda o u s ~ к а i ̂ ~ \delta ı a ф о р a ́ s . ~ C p . ~ I s o c r . ~ N i c o c l . ~$

 रovєvิซıข aủtต̂ข סıaфopâs kaì $\sigma \tau a ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$. A 'difference' is less serious and less long-continued than a 'state of discord,' though it may often end in the production of discord: cp. 7 (5).4. 13०3 b 37, кai
 $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ṽ $\sigma \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$.
39. Tติv тékv$\nu \nu$ includes female as well as male children.
40. $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \alpha \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu$ might well mean here, as often elsewhere, 'the parents,' but it would seem to mean 'the fathers,' if we compare 1335 a $32-35$, for there the father alone must be referred to, inasmuch as he alone would be seventy years of age at the time when the children are approaching their acmê.
 dren's return of service, nor do the children from the assistance given by fathers.' If a man marries (say) at fifty-five, he will probably be in his grave before he gets much assistance from his
children or is able to start them in life. See also vol. i. p. 184,
 see above on 1334 b 12 .
 into the mouth of one of his characters (Fragm. 319),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { кaì עv̂v } \pi a \rho a u \nu \widehat{\omega} ~ \pi a ̂ \sigma \iota ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ \nu \epsilon \omega \tau \tau \in \rho o t s
\end{aligned}
$$

каì $\sigma v \nu \nu \epsilon a ́ S \omega \nu ~ \eta o ̀ ̀ ̀ ~ \pi a i ̂ s ~ \nu \epsilon ́ \varphi ~ \pi a \tau \rho i ́ . ~$

On the un-Attic word $\pi$ ápeүyus see Rutherford, New Phrynichus, p. 120.


 of the kind we have just described,' i.e. near in age to their parents. " $\Omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \dot{\eta} \lambda$ ccé $\bar{\tau} \alpha a \mathbf{s}$, ' as it does also to those of the same


3. каі̀ тєрі̀ тク̀v oỉкоvopíav к.т.д. Cp. Rhet. 2. 1о. 1388 а 5 ,

 каì фӨoveì èmírтaquı" (Aeschyl. Fragm. 298).

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \notin \beta \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$, ср. 1334 ${ }^{2} 29$ sqq. T $\omega \hat{\nu} \gamma \in \nu \nu \omega \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu \omega \nu$, ' of the offspring in process of generation,' whether born or unborn, for тò $\gamma \in \nu \nu \omega \dot{\mu} \mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu \nu$ in
 in Pol. r. 8. 1256 b I3 to the former. After birth, however, $\uparrow \grave{\alpha}$ $\gamma_{\text {rrvó } \mu \mathrm{eva}}$ is the usual designation, as in 1335 b 20,22 , and c. 17 . ${ }^{1} 336 \mathrm{a}$ ェб́, and $\tau \grave{\alpha} \tau \epsilon \in \kappa v a$ is used of a still later stage ( 1334 b 39 ).
 the wish of the lawgiver.' For $\pi$ pós with the acc. in this sense,
 $\pi \rho a ̂ \gamma \mu a$, and other passages collected in Bon. Ind. 642 a 40-54:



6. $\sigma x \in \delta o ̀ v ~ \delta \grave{\eta}$ k.r...., 'now all these things come about in connexion with one arrangement,' or ' one mode of dealing with the subject'-the arrangement being to place the commencement of wedlock at such ages in the case of husband and wife respectively as will enable it to close, so far as the production of children is concerned, at the age of seventy in the case of the husband and fifty in that of the wife, so that at no period of the cohabitation will the power of procreation be wanting to either party. It deserves notice that Aristotle himself was about forty years of age when he married the niece and adopted daughter of Hermias (see vol. i. p. 466). That this union was a happy one may be inferred from the direction in Aristotle's will that his wife's bones should be, in accordance with her request, disinterred and buried with his





 фúरaкє кaтà tàs múdas raúras. The phrase perhaps contains an

 Gr. r. 280): cp. Herodes, Пєрi Пò七reias, p. 175 (Bekker, Orat. Att.,


 place of $\sigma \chi \in \delta \partial \partial \nu \delta \dot{\eta}$, but the result of this transposition is to sever тávra тaùra from the things to which these words refer.
 seventy years' (cp. 35). For the fact, cp. Hist. An. 7. 6. 585 b 5 sqq. Camerarius remarks (Interp. p. $3^{23}$ ), 'haec ita se habere putatur esse certum. Etsi pauca quaedam dissentanea memorantur, ut olim de Masinissa, quem Plutarchus in libello quo quaeritur an senibus capessenda sit respublica ' (c. 15) 'ex Polybio' (37. 10. 5, II sq.) 'narrat, mortuum annos habentem nonaginta, reliquisse superstitem puerum annorum quatuor. Et de Constantia, quae nupsit Friderico Secundo, traditur peperisse eam filium grandiorem annis quinquaginta.' See also Plin. Nat. Hist. 7.6 r sq. Bonitz (Ind. 289 b 16) couples with the passage before us Hist. An. 8. 15 .


 see Sandys' note on 'A $\theta$. Пол. c. 51. 1. 10, ó ẻv ảyopạ oîtos ảpyós.
9. For $\pi \epsilon \nu \tau \eta \dot{\kappa о \nu \tau \alpha, ~ с р . ~ 29, ~ e ́ m т а ̀ ~ к а і ~ т \rho t a ́ к о \nu т а . ~}$
10. $\delta \in \hat{i} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \dot{\nu} \dot{\alpha} \rho \times \grave{\eta} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda_{\text {., 'the commencement of the union, so far }}$ as age is concerned, should reach down at its close to these epochs' (i.e. the close of the union should arrive for the wife at the age of fifty and for the husband at the age of seventy, so that the husband should be twenty years older than the wife at the time of marriage). For катà $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \lambda \iota \kappa i a \nu$, 'in respect of age' as contrasted with time

 $\mu \epsilon \tau о \dot{\pi} \omega \rho о \nu$. For the use of катаßaivєıу, cp. Plut. Demetr. c. 53 , катє́ $\beta \eta$


 conclusion at which he has just arrived, which implies that the bridegroom will be twenty years older than the bride at the time of marriage, and therefore will not be young, and partly in order to settle the age of the bride, which has not yet been settled, Aristotle recalls the fact that the union of young persons is a bad thing. The substantive ovvovaoruós is not used elsewhere in the Politics in the sense of 'coitus,' though it is often thus used in the zoological writings of Aristotle (see Bon. Ind. s.v.), but we have $\sigma v \nu \delta v a \sigma \theta \epsilon \in \tau \omega \nu$ in this sense in 1335 b 24 (cp. also $\sigma v \nu \delta v a ́ \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ in I. 2. 1252 a 26, so far as it refers to the union of male and female). With the passage 1335 a $1 \mathbf{I}-28$ should be compared Plato, Rep. 459 B: Aristot. Hist. An. 5. 14. 544 b 14, $\tau$ ò $\gamma$ àp $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \epsilon \in \omega \nu$ (sc. $\sigma \pi \epsilon ́ \rho \mu a$ ) $\epsilon^{\prime} \nu$












 dтолєintє. Aubert and Wimmer, in their edition of the De Generatione Animalium, remark on this passage, 'this appears from statistical investigations to be correct'; among other authorities they refer to 'the very precise and interesting investigations of Quetelet, Sur l'Homme': see also below on 1335 a 15 . According to Aristox. Fragm. 20 (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 2. 278), Pythagoras recommended (he probably referred to males only) complete

 $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu \epsilon \cup ̉ \in \xi \in i a \nu \pi o \lambda v ̀ ~ \sigma v \mu \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota:$ see also below on 1335 b 37 , ívtєías $\chi$ र́pıv. At Sparta, care was taken that both bridegroom and bride should be in their bodily prime (Xen. Rep. Lac. i. 6 : Plut. Lycurg. c. 15 , cp. Num. et Lycurg. inter se comp. c. 4, where the custom at Rome is contrasted with the Lacedaemonian custom). It is evident from 28 sq. that Aristotle does not class a girl of eighteen among the véal, at all events so far as fitness for marriage is concerned.
13. ảtє $\lambda \hat{\eta}$, 'imperfect,' i.e. lacking some limb or organ, or with :ome limb or organ imperfectly developed, or lacking some sense, for instance the sense of sight or hearing (De An. 3. I. $4^{2} 5$ a 9 sqq.), or some power, for instance the power of movement (De An. 3.9. 432 b $2 \mathrm{I}-26$ ) or speech, or the power to procreate (cp. Hist. An. 7. 1. 58 I b 2 I sqq., and De An. 2. 4. 415 a 26 sqq. and 3. 9. 432 b 21 sqq.), or possibly imperfect in mind (cp. 1335 b 29 sqq.), idiotic or the like. As infants born imperfect are not to be reared in Aristotle's 'best State' ( 1335 b 20), and the offspring of the overyoung is often imperfect, much destruction of infant life would be saved by the prohibition of the marriage of those who are over-young.
$\mu \iota \kappa \rho \alpha ̀ ~ \tau \eta े \nu ~ \mu о \rho ф \grave{\eta} \nu, ~ ' s m a l l ~ i n ~ f i g u r e ': ~ c p . ~ P i n d a r, ~ I s t h m . ~ 4 . ~ 53, ~$ норфà̀ ßpaxús. In 17 we have $\mu \kappa \kappa \rho o i ̀ ~ \tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \omega ̈ \mu a \tau \alpha$. To be small in person was to lack beauty (Eth. Nic. 4. 7. I123 b 6 sqq.). 'o $\mu$ เкpós was 'a term of reproach at Athens' (Liddell and Scott s.v.: Leutsch and Schneidewin, Paroem. Gr. 1. 280, note : cp. also 7 (5). 10. I3II b 3).
15. Ėv öซaıs $\gamma \grave{\mathrm{a}} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. Vict. 'hoc autem vulgo de plebe Gallorum dicitur, apud quos mala haec consuetudo increbruit; unde notantur etiam voce ostendente erratum hoc ipsorum irridenteque beevitatem corporis corundem et deformitatem.' Among the States
other than Troezen to which Aristotle here refers, Crete should probably be included. Cp. Ephor. Fragm. 64 (Strabo, p. 482 :

 age referred to would be the expiration of the eighteenth year according to Dareste, Inscriptions Juridiques Grecques, p. 408. The bride in Crete might be no more than twelve years of age (ibid. p. 407). The early age at which daughters were given in marriage at Troezen is probably an indication of material prosperity, for the father no doubt had to provide his daughter with a dowry. In Crete the bridegroom did not take his bride home till she was old enough to manage a household (Strabo, p. 482), and the actual provision of a dowry by the father may have been delayed till then. 'In a meeting of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, M. Joseph Körösi, Director of the Buda-Pest Statistical Bureau, read a paper on the "Influence of Parents' Ages on the Vitality of Children." . . . M. Körösi has collected about 30,000 data, and has come to the following con-clusions:-Mothers under twenty years of age and fathers under twenty-four have children more weakly than parents of riper age. Their children are more subject to pulmonary diseases. The healthiest children are those whose fathers are from twenty-five to forty years of age, and whose motheris are from twenty to thirty years old' (Times, Jan. 14, 1889).
 and Scott refer to Nymphis, ap. Athen. Deipn. 6r9 f, kará rıva

18. Saa申धєipovtar, 'die.' Bonitz (Ind. s.v.) compares De Gen. An. 4. 4. 773 a 18 sqq.



 The literal meaning of these words was 'let fallow land remain fallow, do not plough up uncultivated land,' or in other words 'let the land rest.' The verb veầ and the substantive veatós (Xen. Oecon. 7. 20) were used of the ploughing-up of fallow land (see Liddell and Scott). Cp. also Anth. Pal. 6. 4 I,

As, however, the land which had been left for a time fallow was the land which would naturally be used for ploughing, the advice
of the oracle came in effect to this, that ploughing should cease for a time and that crops should not be raised. No wonder that men rejected this interpretation of the oracle and cast about for anotherthat given in the text. A third interpretation was, indeed, possible. The oracle might be understood as a warning against rash innova-


 see above on 1284 a 23 .
 adolescentulae nuptui traderentur' (уарібкєө月aı being taken as passive: so Lamb. and Sus.), or 'because the custom was to take the younger women to wife' ( $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\mu \mu \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \epsilon \sigma \theta a i}$ being taken as middle : so Liddell and Scott). Perhaps the words which follow,
 the bridegroom, is referred to, make rather in favour of the former interpretation. Гaцiбкє川 is a rare word.
22. кaì трòs $\sigma \omega ф \rho o \sigma u ́ v \eta \nu$, as well as $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \tau \epsilon \kappa \nu o \pi o u ́ a \nu ~(12) . ~$
 in marriage, when they are older' (literally 'to make their givingsaway in marriage for girls when older ').

 also are thought to suffer injury in respect of growth, if they have intercourse with females while the seed is still increasing, for the seed also [as well as the body, the increase of which has just been referred to] is subject to a fixed limit of time, which it does not overpass in its increase, or overpasses only slightly, [so that it is not an indifferent matter whether intercourse occurs at an earlier or later age].' The editors from Vict. downward, so far as I have observed, with the exceptions of Reiz and Göttling, read $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \operatorname{aros}$ in place of $\sigma \pi \pi^{\prime} \rho \mu a t o s$, and there is much doubt as to the correct reading. The words $\sigma \omega \bar{\omega} \mu a$ and $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \rho \mu a$ are occasionally interchanged in the MSS.-e.g. in De Gen. An. 2. 3. 737 a 11 we should probably read $\sigma \hat{\omega} \mu a$ with Aubert and Wimmer in place of $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a$, and in Chaeremon, Fragm. 13, I would read ' $\Omega \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \pi \epsilon$ ép $\mu \tau^{\prime}$ in place of ' $\Omega \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \nu \dot{\omega} \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau$ '. It is therefore not without hesitation that I retain $\sigma \pi$ épرatos in the passage before us. I do so for the following reasons: ( I ) It is the reading of all the better MSS., for even


[^11]$\mathrm{P}^{1}$ has ä $\lambda \lambda \omega$ s $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu$ atos in its margin. Vet. Int. has 'corpore,' but whether he found $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$ in the Greek text used by him is doubtful, for he may well have translated a marginal reading. Susemihl ascribes the reading $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s ~ t o ~ L e o n a r d u s ~ A r e t i n u s, ~ b u t ~ S c h n e i d e r ~$ says (Politica, vol. ii. p. 436), 'Aldinum et plurium Victorii codicum scripturam $\sigma \pi \epsilon$ ' $\mu$ autos reddidit Aretinus,' and a manuscript of his Latin Translation belonging to Balliol College, Oxford (MS. Ball. 242)-I have not consulted any others-has 'ac masculorum corpora crescere impediuntur si adhuc augente semine consuetudinem ineant.' (2) If we read $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$, it is not easy to see, as Schneider has already pointed out in his note on the passage, why Aristotle did not simply write кaì $\tau a ̀ \tau \omega ิ \nu$ á $\rho \rho \in ́ v \omega \nu$ dè $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a \quad \beta \lambda a ́ \pi \tau \epsilon-$
 тồ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s) ~ \pi o \iota \omega ิ \nu \tau a \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ \sigma v \nu o v \sigma i a \nu: ~ S e p u l v e d a, ~ i n ~ f a c t ~(p . ~ 240), ~$
 MSS. and prefers this reading. Besides, the added remark kaì $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ - ẽt $\iota$ seems rather otiose, if it refers to the body, for every one knows that the growth of the body ceases after a certain age. (3) The difficulty has been raised by Schneider that we nowhere read in Aristotle of a 'certus temporis terminus seminis augmento atque incremento definitus, ultra quem progrediatur nunquam, quoque intercepto corporis incrementum impediatur.' 'Corporis incrementum,' he adds, 'intra vigesimum fere annum aetatis consistere solet, seminis vero incrementum et copia pro natura alimentorum aliasque per causas variatur usque ad annum sexagesimum.' The question is one for thorough students of Aristotle's physiology to decide, and I cannot pretend to be one of them, but it should


 age not indeed of a man, but of an animal, and if he believed in a decrease of the secretion after a certain age, he may well have believed in an increase of it up to a certain age. Some indications of his having done so are traceable, if we can trust the Seventh Book of the History of Animals, c. 5.585 a $36, \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ oṽ $\tau^{\prime}$ à $\rho \chi^{\circ-}$



 Compare what we read in Hist. An. 7. 1. $5^{S I}$ b 2 sqq. of the
effect on bodily growth of a discharge of $\tau \grave{a} \lambda$ $\lambda u k a ́ i o n ~ e a r l y ~ c h i l d-~$ hood, for the catamenia in the female answer to the seed in the


 cp. 3. 13. 1284 a 22 and 3.14. 1285 a 34. As to ( $\hat{\eta} \mu$ $\mu$ крóv), see critical note.
 should have expected from Hist. An. 7. 1. 582 a 16-29 (quoted in part above on II) that Aristotle would have delayed the age of marriage for women till twenty-one, but this would have involved a shortening of the duration of wedlock, as it is to close before the wife is fifty years of age. The male reaches the acmê of his physical development between thirty and thirty-five (see vol. i. p. 186, note 2 , and cp .1335 a $3^{2} \mathrm{sq}$.), so that Aristotle might well have placed the age of marriage for the male a little earlier than he does, but he probably wishes to make the duration of wedlock the same for husband and wife (about thirty-two years). As to the ages recommended by Plato, see vol. i. p. 183 .
29. As to [ $\dagger \boldsymbol{\eta} \mu$ ккрóv] , see critical note.

 while their bodies are in their prime.' For the importance of this, cp. Plato, Rep. 459 B and Xen. Mem. 4. 4. 23.

32. Toîs $\mu \dot{v} v$, the children, answering to тoî $\delta \dot{\epsilon}, 34$, the fathers.

 now been brought to a close' (cp. De Gen. An. 1. 19. 727 a 8 , kal

 $\mu e ̀ \nu \pi \lambda \epsilon i \nu$ ката $\lambda \in \lambda_{v k a}$ ), or possibly 'having now been wrecked.' For $\pi \rho \rho$ s, 'towards,' see Bon. Ind. 64 r b 9 , where we find a reference among other passages to De Gen. An. 5. 1.778 a 25 , rà $\mu \hat{\nu} \nu$ yà $\rho$



 connexion with season,' in contradistinction to oi $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀ \tau \eta \nu \quad \dot{\eta} \lambda c k i a \nu$
 H h 2



37．ois oi modnoi k．т．$\lambda$ ．There is a tacit antithesis between oi тoд入oi and oi iarpoi and oi фибוкoi，40．In reference to the question of season，which is a very simple one，we need not have recourse to the opinion of learned men ；the verdict of the many will suffice：



 marry in the winter throughout Greece and not merely in Attica． In ípíauves Aristotle probably refers to a custom or unwritten law．


 cp．Alcaeus，Fragm．13， 39 with Bergk＇s notes，and Hist．An．5． 8. 542 a $3^{2}$ ）．＇In 1876 Dr．Kulischer，in a paper in the Zeitschrift fuir Ethnologie，collected details of human pairing－seasons，as marked by festivals of plainly matrimonial intent，and brought forward still more distinct evidence from the statistics of births， which show maxima and minima pointing to two especial pairing－ times，about New Year and in late spring．Dr．Westermarck＇ ［in his history of Human Marriage，Macmillan，1891］＇brings new evidence to bear on the subject＇（Prof．E．B．Tylor，Academy， Oct．3，189r）．

38．Tìv auvau入íav тaúrqv，＇this kind of diwelling together．＇ Evpaviáa in this sense is connected with aủ入í，not aủ入ós，and is a very rare word，but Bekk．${ }^{2}$ is no doubt wrong in following Lamb．，who reads $\sigma v v o u \sigma i a v$. The word j juaviia occurs in Aesch．
 Scott），and Schn．points out that Plato（Laws 72 I D）＇caelibatum eodem modo $\mu$ ovaviáav vocavit．＇There were other kinds of quvaviáa，

 also in turn＇（as well as the lawgiver，cp． 1334 b 33 and 1335 b 14 ） ＇should study the teaching of physicians and that of physical philosophers．＇For $\bar{\eta} \delta \partial \eta$ see note on 1258 b 18： $\bar{\eta} 00 \eta$ here lends emphasis to a pronoun，as in that passage and often elsewhere （e．g．in 2．8．1268b21：4（7）．2．1324a14：7（5）．10．1313a10）．


 тav̂t' '̇' $\sigma t i$, and see note on 1324 a 25 .
 way the favourable moments of the body [for the procreation of children].' Hesiod had recommended the time after a sacrificial feast (Op. et Dies 735,

$\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \mu a i v \epsilon \iota \nu \quad \gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \notin \nu$, ả $\lambda \lambda^{’}$ ả $\theta a \nu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ àmò $\left.\delta a \iota \tau o ́ s\right)$,
but some were wholly against the time after a feast of any kind, even the ordinary $\delta \in i \pi \nu o \nu$, and among them was Epicurus (Plut. Sympos. 3. 6: Usener, Epicurea, Fragm. 6 1, p. 117 sq.). Cp. Plato, Laws 674 B, Plut. Lycurg. c. 15 , and Diog. Laert. 7. 18. We learn the opinion of the Athenian physician Mnesitheus



 סıa日' $\sigma \in \omega s$ (cp. De Part. An. 4. 10. 689 a 29 sqq.). As to the dawn of day, see Aristoph. Lysistr. 966 Didot.

1. каì $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i} \tau \omega ิ \nu \pi \nu \in \cup \mu a ́ t \omega \nu$ oi фuбıkoí. Cp. De Gen. An. 4. 2. 766 b 1335 b).




 945 a 18 sq. Plato recognizes the influence of winds on generation in Laws 747 D .
 sideration in 1334 b 3 r is taken up, so far at least as relates to the body. Plato had already said something on the subject in Laws 775 B sqq.: cp. 779 D sqq. The view which prevailed at Sparta may be gathered from Xen. Rep. Lac. I. 4, taís $\delta^{\prime}$ ' $\lambda \epsilon v-$



 $\mu \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \tau \rho a$ yí $\nu \in \sigma \theta a l$, and Plut. Lycurg. c. 14 : compare the fragment of Critias quoted in vol. i. p. 350 , note I .
 1275 a 16 ．Subjects often receive only a hasty consideration in the Fourth Book，a fuller treatment of them later on being pro－
 $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu(\mathrm{sc} . \tau \grave{̀} \nu \lambda$ रóyov，cp．Пєрì そんฑ̂s кaì Өavátov 6．470 b 5），we see

 тaıôovouias，perhaps＇in the inquiries respecting the management of children，＇rather than＇in the inquiries respecting the education of children，＇which is the rendering of Sepulv．，Vict．，Lamb．，and Liddell and Scott．Пaьoоуодia is used in a different sense in 8 （6）． 8．I 322 b 39 and 1323 a 4．It seems strange that Aristotle should intend to treat the question $\pi \operatorname{moi}^{i} \omega \tau \tau \nu \omega \bar{\omega}$ к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．in an inquiry respect－ ing the management of children．He apparently designed to include a discussion of the subject in the Politics；no such discus－ sion，however，finds a place in the work as we have it（for other cases of the same thing，see vol．ii．p．xxvii）．

5．тúmẹ $\delta$ ©è ikavòv єimeîv kaì vûv，＇but one should now also say what is adequate in outline．＇Sus．inserts $\delta \in i$ after ikavóv，but，as he himself suggests in Sus．${ }^{1}$ ，Addenda，p．lxiv，it seems likely that $\delta \in \hat{i}$ is to be supplied here from $\lambda_{\epsilon \kappa \tau \epsilon ́ \sigma, ~} 4$ ：cp． 6 （4）． 13.1297 b 3 sqq．， where $\delta \in i \nu$ must apparently be supplied with vimáp $\begin{gathered}\epsilon \nu \\ \text { and } \\ \delta \in i \\ \text { with }\end{gathered}$ тáттєь．Bonitz does not refer to the passage before us in Ind．I68 a 54 sqq．，where he considers one or two other cases in which $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ may be thought to be omitted．Aristotle inherits the expression $\tau \dot{\pi} \pi \varrho$ from Plato，in whose writings it occurs frequently．A túnos is the outline or $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta}$（cp．Laws $876 \mathrm{D}, \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \gamma \rho a \phi \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \epsilon$ кai $\tau$ ov̀s тúmous $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \iota \mu \omega \rho \iota \omega \nu$ єimóvtas）which an artist draws before filling in his picture：see note on 1263 a 3 r．

оüтє $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к．т．入．Cp．Eth．Nic．6．I． 1138 b 26，кaì үà $\rho$ èv тaîs


 Xenophanes，Fragm． 2 Bergk，Eurip．Fragm．284，and Plato，Rep． $403 \mathrm{E}-407$ E，where Stallbaum compares Plut．Philopoemen c． 3. What Plato objects to in athletes，however，is their sleepiness and inability to stand the rapid changes of diet which are inseparable from a soldier＇s life，whereas Aristotle rather objects to the tendencies impressed on their constitution by severe toil of one monotonous kind．For the order of the words in $5-8$ ，see note on 1327 a 4.
6. $\pi \rho o ̀ s \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \iota k \eta ̀ v$ $\epsilon u \in \xi i ́ \alpha v$, 'with a view to the kind of bodily fitness that is useful to a citizen': cp. Xen. Oecon. II.I3. Evegia differs from strength, and it also differs from health; it is the business of a gymnastic trainer to produce $\epsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \xi i a$, just as it is the business of a physician to produce health (Top, 5.7.1 37 a 3 sqq.). But the $\epsilon \dot{v} \varepsilon \xi i a$ which Aristotle speaks of here is not gymnastic $\epsilon \dot{v} \in \xi i a$, but the $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \in \xi i a$ which makes a man an efficient citizen, fit in body to bear the labours which fall to the lot of soldiers and citizens.
mpòs íyílav kai тєкvotooiav. As to the ill-effect of the training of athletes on health, cp. Plato, Rep. 403 E sq., and as to its


 ท̀ àpүoûvтєs.
7. какотои $т \iota к \eta$ и, ' unfit for labour,' 'labouring ill,' like какóтขovs, ' breathing ill,' or какоӨávatos, 'dying ill.'
8. $\pi \in \pi \circ \nu \eta \mu \in ́ v \eta \nu ~ \mu e ̀ v ~ o u ̂ v ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ O u ̂ ̀ \nu ~ h e r e ~ c o n t a i n s ~ a n ~ i n f e r e n c e ~$ from what precedes, as in 1. 1. $125^{2}$ a 7 (see note on that passage). Hóvos is the source of $\in \dot{v} \in \xi \xi_{i}^{\prime a}$ (Phys. 2. 3. 195 a 8 sqq.: Metaph. $\Delta$. 2. ro13 b 9 sq. : cp. Pol. 7 (5). 9. 1310 a 23 sqq.). Compare what Atalanta is made to say in Eurip. Fragm. 529,

$\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ढ่้ סó



But Atalanta's training had been that of a huntress, not that of an athlete. The toils which Aristotle would recommend to married women would, however, rather be the light and varied toils of the mistress of a household, as to which we learn much from the advice given by Ischomachus to his wife in Xen. Oecon. c. ro. 10 sq. For
 àvá $\gamma \kappa \eta \nu$ п $\quad$ óvous.
9. $\pi$ pòs êva $\mu$ óvov, sc. $\pi$ óvov (Ridgeway and Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ).
11. о́ $\mu$ оí $\omega$ s $\delta$ è к.т. $\lambda .$, ' and these physical characteristics should be possessed alike by men and women,' so that women no less than men should $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \hat{i} \sigma \theta a \iota \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$. (Tav̂тa is in the plural because the characteristics are many.) Aristotle's language is very similar

 ä $\sigma \kappa \epsilon i v$ ס $\epsilon i v$ ，but Plato goes much further both in Rep． $45^{1} \mathrm{C}-457 \mathrm{~B}$ and in Laws $804 \mathrm{C}-806 \mathrm{C}$ than Aristotle does here．

12．Xpク̀ סè к．т．入．＇Pregnant women also，＇as well as those marrying．＇E $\boldsymbol{\gamma \kappa v} \mu \omega \nu$ is the Attic word rather than ${ }^{\prime} \not \subset \kappa v o s$ ．Aristotle here follows in the track of Lycurgus and Plato：cp．Xen．Rep．



 ordered a different course，and Plato，Laws 788 D sqq．and 789 D，

 ধ́roì $\sigma \pi a \rho \gamma a v a ̂ \nu$ ．Not only would the unborn child profit by the exercise taken by the mother，but the mother herself would secure an easier delivery（De Gen．An．4．6． 775 a 30 sqq．）．
 nant women shall not take little food and exercise．
$\pi \rho о \sigma \tau \dot{d} \dot{\beta} \alpha \nu \tau \iota$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．Tıvá is of course to be taken with mopeiav． Aristotle here perhaps takes a hint from Plato，who in Laws 833 B had made a temple the goal of a foot－race：cp．also Laws 789 E ．
 ＇partus＇（Bon．Ind． 149 a 3 sqq．），cp．Plato，Phileb． 6 i B，eïтє
 $\kappa \rho a ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s$ ．Notwithstanding the gender of $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon_{i} \lambda \eta \chi^{\circ}{ }^{\circ} \tau \omega \nu$ ，the gods referred to are no doubt Eileithyia（Hom．Il．II． 270 sq．：Paus．8． 32. 4 ：Theocr． 17.60 sqq．）and Artemis（Plato，Theaet． 149 B，aitià
 perhaps also Demeter Calligeneia（C．F．Hermann，Gr．Ant． 2. §56．19）and at Athens the Tpıтomáropes（Phanodem．Fragm．4： Müller，Fr．Hist．Gr．r． $3^{67}$ ）．The temples of Eileithyia in the Peloponnesus were often just outside the city－gate（see note on r331 a 26）．＇A $\pi \sigma \theta \epsilon \rho a \pi \epsilon i a \nu$, from àmo $\theta \in \rho a \pi \epsilon \dot{v} \epsilon \nu$, ＇to honour zealously＇

 at a temple would be an indication of zealous worship：cp．Plut．




16．Tク̀v $\mu$ évтol Stávolav k．т．त．What is the construction of tìv

סtávotav? Is it in the acc. after $\delta$ á $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$, the subject of $\delta \iota a \operatorname{y} \epsilon \iota \nu$ being ràs ধ́ykúous understood and ס九áyєıv itself being here used in the sense



 'in respect of the mind'? Or is $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta t a ́ v o t a \nu$ the subject of $\delta$ tá $\gamma \epsilon \iota$ used intransitively? Sepulveda, who translates, 'mentem autem contra quam corpus tranquillam securamque gerere convenit,' appears to adopt the first of these interpretations, Victorius, who translates, ' mente autem contra atque corpore sedatius remissiusque degere convenit,' the second (so Stahr and Sus.), Mr. Welldon, who translates, 'their mind unlike their bodies should at such a time be comparatively indolent,' the third. I incline to the second interpretation: no instance of $\delta$ cá $y \epsilon \iota \nu$ being used in the sense of 'to keep' is given in the Index Aristotelicus, and in 6 (4). II. 1295 b $3^{2}$ sq. the word is used intransitively. The reason why Aristotle advises the avoidance of mental labour appears to be because it would 'be a hindrance to the body' (5 (8). 4. I339 a 7 sqq.) and he wishes the bodily state of the mother to be as good as possible. Compare the advice given by Plato in Laws 792 E , where however he counsels the avoidance of an excess of pleasures and pains rather than of mental labour. We expect $\tau \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$ in $\mathbf{I} 7$ rather than $\tau \omega ิ \nu \sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.
18. àmo久aúovтa . . . фаivetal, 'evidently are influenced by.'
 Gen. An. 2. 4. 740 a 26,37 , and $3 \cdot 3 \cdot 754 \mathrm{~b}$ I are referred to.
19. $\check{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho ~ \tau \grave{\alpha}$ фuó $\mu \epsilon v a$ Tท̂s $\gamma \hat{\eta}$. Cp. De Gen. An. 2. 4. 740 a 24,


 In this passage and also in that before us Aristotle seems to have in his memory Hippocr. De Natura Pueri, I. 414 Kühn, $\phi \eta \mu \grave{l}$ زà $\rho$




 rearing of children, let there be a law that defective offspring shall not be reared, but that offspring shall not be exposed on the ground
of an excessive number of children [as distinguished from that of imperfection], in case the customs of the State, as regulated by the lawgiver' (literally, 'the ordering of the customs '), 'are opposed to an excessive number, for the amount of reproductive intercourse should be fixed, and if any parents have offspring in consequence of intercourse taking place beyond that limit, abortion should be produced before sensation and life develope in the embryo, for that which is holy in this matter will be marked off from that which is not by the absence or presence of sensation and life.' See on this passage vol. i. p. 187 and notes 2 and 3. In Greece the poor were often unwilling to rear children, especially daughters: cp. Plut. De
 к.т..入., and Poseidipp. 'Epرaфро́óıros Fragm. (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 516),

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { vì̀̀ } \tau \rho \in ́ \phi \in t ~ \pi a ̂ s ~ \kappa a ̂ ̀ \nu ~ \pi e ́ v \eta s ~ \tau t s ~ ڤ ̀ \nu ~ \tau u ́ X n, ~
\end{aligned}
$$

The Greeks noticed with surprise that in Egypt all children born were reared (Aristot. Fragm. 258. 1525 a 37 sqq.: Strabo, p. 824). In Aristotle's ' best State' exposure would be resorted to only in the case of imperfectly developed offspring, or rather of offspring the imperfection of which was obvious at the moment of birth, for not all the kinds of imperfection noticed above on 1335 a $I_{3}$ would be traceable at birth. The rule at Sparta was not to rear anything àyevvès кaì ä $\mu$ орфov (Plut. Lycurg. c. 16). Seneca says of Rome (De Ira I. 15), liberos quoque, si debiles monstrosique editi sunt, mergimus. I know not whether $\dot{a} \pi \dot{d} \theta \epsilon \sigma \iota$ in the sense of the 'exposing of children' occurs elsewhere. For $\dot{\eta}$ тágss $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ ' $\theta \hat{\theta} \nu$, cp. $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu$
 (so Vict. ' in illis locis ubi lege interdictum est ne quis pater alat




 excess of the legal limit' (so Vict. and Stahr), or possibly 'in contravention of the legal limit' (cp. Plato, Polit. 300 D, where

 quvòvacteírt), Reiz (quoted by Schn.) compares Hom. Il. 16. 531,

 to Thuc. 3. 13.9 and Xen. Cyrop. 1.4.2. See also notes on $\mathbf{1 2 8 1}$ b 4 and 13 .





 that of Diogenes of Apollonia (Fragm. 5: Mullach, Fr. Philos. Gr. 1. 254). Aristotle is here speaking not of life in general, but of animal life, for plants also live, and in their case $\zeta \omega \grave{\eta} \nu \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu \tau \eta ̀ \nu \delta i$
 De An. 3. 12. 434 a 27.
 $\hat{\epsilon} \mu \pi$ тוtiv $\theta a t$ here as middle, but the verb seems to be rarely used in this sense in the middle voice, and perhaps Sus. is right in taking it as passive. In the 'oath of Hippocrates' which was sworn by aspirants to medical practice one of the promises made is that the taker of the oath will not produce abortion. The thing, however, was no doubt occasionally done not only by physicians but by midwives (Plato, Theaet. 149 D ).
 violations of duty to near relatives, see note on 1262 a 28 . The abortion of an embryo in which sensation and life had already developed would involve a violation of this nature.
 for marriage for man and wife has been defined' (in $\mathbf{1} 335^{\text {a }}$ 28 sqq.), 'and it has been settled at what age they should begin their union.' As to the $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\nu}$ solitarium in $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\mu} \nu \dot{\partial} \rho \chi \chi$, see notes on 1262 a 6 and 1270 a 34. The suppressed clause here is 'but the end of it has not.'
 to the begetting of children, according to Liddell and Scott (so also Mr. Welldon): Sus., on the other hand, translates 'sich diesem Geschäfte zu widmen' ('to devote themselves to this task'), and Stahr 'dem Kinderzeugen obzuliegen,' following in the track of Lamb., 'liberis procreandis operam dare.' Perhaps, as Plato speaks in Rep. 460 E of $\tau i k \tau \epsilon \epsilon \nu \hat{\eta} \pi \bar{\partial} \lambda \epsilon t$ and $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \hat{\nu} \tau \hat{\eta} \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$, the first of these two interpretations is to be preferred. For $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime}$, cp. 6 (4). 4.

1291 a 35，тò $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ tàs à $\rho \chi$ às $\lambda \epsilon \iota \tau o v \rho \gamma o u ̂ \nu$ ．＇Apرóттєє is used in association with $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \eta$ here as with $\delta \in i$ in 6 （4）．I5．1299 b I4．
 23 and Plato，Rep． 459 B．By oi $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \iota$ Aristotle here means oi $\pi a \rho \eta \kappa \mu a \kappa o ́ \tau \epsilon s$, i．e．those over fifty or perhaps fifty－five ：cp．Rhet．
 967 b 13 sqq．oi $\pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta \dot{\tau} \tau \epsilon \rho o \iota$ are apparently identified with oi $\gamma \eta \rho a ́ \sigma-$ коутєя．See notes on 1329a13 and 1321 a 22．By oi $\gamma \epsilon \gamma \eta \rho a \kappa o ́ t \epsilon s$ Aristotle may probably mean men over sixty，or sixty－five．Mem－ bership of the Lacedaemonian $\gamma \in \rho o v \sigma i a$ was confined to men who had passed their sixtieth year．When Aristotle says that the children of aged fathers are $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \theta \in \nu \epsilon i s$, he perhaps means more than
 emotion（see note on I342 a II）．
 тоוias：so Lamb．＇quare id tempus praefiniatur，in quo mens maxime viget ac floret，＇Coray，and others．Aristotle is speaking of the mental prime of the husband，not the wife．The bodily prime of a man falls between thirty and thirty－five（see above on 1335 a 28）．
 however places the mental prime between forty－two and fifty－six． There is a further reference to these poets in c． 17.1336 b 40 sqq．

35．ต̈бтє тє́ттароь้ к．т．入．Plato also in the Republic（460 E） closes the period of $\tau \in \kappa \nu o \pi o t i a$ for the man at fifty－five，adding that in his case the mental and bodily prime lies between twenty－five and fifty－five．Sir Nicholas Bacon（born in 1509）was fifty－two years of age when his famous son Francis was born to him in 1561 ． Lord Chatham was fifty－one when William Pitt was born to him． Sir John Herschel（born in 1792）was born when his father Sir William Herschel（born in $173^{8}$ ）was fifty－four years of age． How many other great men have had fathers over fifty at the time



37．тò Sè 入oเтòv к．т．入．Compare Plato，Rep．46I B sq．，where Plato does not impose this restriction on the intercourse of those over the legal age，if only they take care that no offspring shall see the light or，supposing it does，shall live．
ú útías Xápır．Cp．De Gen．An．1．18． 725 b 8 sqq．， 726 a 22， and $5 \cdot 3 \cdot 783$ b 29 sq．，and Probl．4．29． 880 a 22 sqq．See also

Plin．Nat．Hist．28．58，and the case of Timochares in Hippocr． De Morbis Vulgaribus 5，vol．iii．p． 574 Kühn．Pythagoras probably would not have admitted that health could ever be thus promoted（cp．Diog．Laert．8．9）．
 tioned in conjunction with ívita，e．g．in Phys．7．3．246 b 4 ：Plato， Rep． 559 A，Protag． 354 B．Cp．Laws 708 B，т兀ö̀ ä̀ $\lambda$ oıs тoooívo七s $\pi а$ пйцабл．
 resort to the intercourse．＇
 to the intercourse of a husband with another woman than his wife， or of a wife with another man than her husband．＇Aristotle has




 dir $\mu \mu \zeta \epsilon \epsilon \theta \omega$ ，and 84 I C sqq．Both Aristotle and Plato（in Laws
 seem to confine themselves to the prohibition of unconcealed adultery．Cp．Isocr．Nicocl．§ 40．The writer of the First Book of the Oeconomics（c．4．1344a 8－13）appears to go further． Contrast with all this the occasional permission to Spartan wives of intercourse with other men than their husbands（Plut．Lycurg． c．15）．

39．$\dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \omega \hat{\mathrm{s}}$ ，＇broadly，＇＇at any time，＇in contradistinction to $\pi \in \rho \mathfrak{}$




40．$\dot{\alpha} \pi т$ ó $\mu \in \nu 0 \nu$ фaivec⿴al，＇openly to touch＇：cp．Plato，Laws

 Plato had already used the word änte | atat in Laws $84 \mathrm{I} \mathrm{D}, \mu \eta \delta \bar{\delta} \dot{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{o}$ |
| :--- |

 the passages which Aristotle has before him here．Bonitz（Ind．s．v．） compares Probl．4．29．880a 28 sq．
$\mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \delta \alpha \mu \omega \hat{s}$ occurs in Plato，Laws 777 E ，and $\mu \eta \delta \partial \mu \hat{\omega} s \mu \eta \delta a \mu \hat{\eta}$ in Laws 820 B，but I know not whether $\mu \eta \delta a \mu \hat{\eta} \mu \eta \delta a \mu \hat{\omega} s$ occurs elsewhere in Aristotle＇s writings．The Index Aristotelicus omits the phrase，and incleed by some error the word $\mu \eta \delta \partial \mu \omega \hat{\omega}$ ．חávrn
$\pi \dot{\mu} \nu \tau \omega s$ is a phrase frequently employed by Aristotle (see Bon. Ind. s.v. $\pi$ ávtı).
ötav ท̂ kaì mporayopeuө̂n nóats. Kai here probably means 'or,' as in 2. 3. 1262 a 8 (see notes on 1262 a 6 and 1303 a 20 ). The word $\pi \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \iota$ is ised here and in 1. 3.1253 b 6 by Aristotle, but it is a poetical word, seldom used in prose. On $\pi \rho o \sigma a \gamma o p e v \theta \theta \hat{\eta}$, see Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective, s. v. àyopeíc.
c.17. 3 sqq. Aristotle says little in this chapter which had not 1336 a. already been said by Plato, and throughout the whole of it he seems to write with the Seventh Book of the Laws before him, but he brings together, and thus makes more effective, what Plato had said in a scattered and often an incidental way. He sometimes differs from Plato; thus he is for rearing children under seven to a greater extent at home than Plato had proposed to do, he will not have their crying restrained, etc. In recommending, again, that children should be habituated from their earliest infancy to bear heat and cold, he goes beyond anything contemplated by Plato or practised at Sparta (Xen. Rep. Lac. 2. 4) or in Crete (Ephor. Fragm. 64: Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. I. 250), for neither the Spartans nor the Cretans seem to have begun this habituation in babyhood, and Plato speaks of $\epsilon \kappa \pi a i \partial \omega \nu$ (Rep. 403 C), not, like Aristotle, of $\epsilon^{\kappa} \kappa \mu \kappa \rho \bar{\rho} \nu \pi a i \delta \omega \nu$, when he refers to the subject (Rep. 404 A ); it is rather from some barbarian races, such as the Celts, that Aristotle learns this lesson, as indeed he himself tells us. He keeps the same end in view in his rules as to the rearing of children as he does in his rules as to marriage ; he seeks in both to secure that the children shall be well-grown in body and sound in mind and likely to make good soldiers and citizens in afteryears. Rearing comes first, covering the whole period up to seven years of age, and then comes education (c. 17. 1336b37 sqq.). Aristotle confines himself during the first two or three years of life to studying the physical development of the child in accordance with the principle laid down in c. 15.1334 b ${ }_{2} 5$ sqq., but after that age he pays attention to the development not only of the body, but of the opeftss and character. Till seven the children must necessarily in his opinion be reared at home, and consequently must be more or less in the company of slaves, and he evidently fears that if they are much in the company of slaves at this impressible time -the age at which permanent tastes are acquired, $\pi$ ávra $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \sigma \tau_{\epsilon} \rho \gamma{ }^{\circ}-$ $\mu \epsilon \nu \tau \grave{a} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau a \quad \mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu(1336 \mathrm{~b} 33$ )-they may acquire a taint of
illiberal feeling and indecency of which it will not be easy to rid them in later life. This leads him to pay special attention to the years from two or three to seven.
 the opening sentences of the Seventh Book of the Laws ( 788 A ,

 with outerөau: Aristotle forgets that he has not used the word since c. 16.1335 b 38 , and that the imperatives $\tilde{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \omega(39)$ and $\xi_{\eta \mu \mu o v} \sigma \theta \omega$ (1336a $\mathbf{1}$ ), which however contain in them much of the force of
 determining influence one way or the other': we expect rather

 6. 1340 b 22 ), but that which produces a difference is often termed a $\delta u$ aфopá, just as that which produces fear is sometimes termed фópos. Compare the construction noticed in the note on 1264 a 39.
5. фaiveтai $\tau \epsilon$ к.т...., 'and evidently, if we investigate the question by a reference to the lower animals and to the barbarian nations which make it their aim to introduce the habit of body suitable for war, food abounding in milk is most congenial to the bodies [of infants], and with little wine in it on account of the

 Фaive $\theta a u$ without an infinitive or a participle may mean either 'to appear' or 'evidently to be' (Bon. Ind. 808 b 52 sqq.) ; here it probably means the latter. The nom. to фaivetat is $\dot{\eta}$ тov̀ yádaктos
 see note on 1328a 19. The nations referred to are no doubt those mentioned in c. 2. 1324 b 9 sqq., and especially the Scythians: cp . Antiphanes, Mıбoтóvppos (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 85),



We read of the milk-drinking Hippemolgi in Hom. II. 13. 5. The Greeks, however, mostly used goats' milk (Büchsenschütz, Besitz und Erwerb, p. $3^{11}$ ) ; they used ewes' milk but little (ibid.), and they regarded the milk of cows (Plut. Pelop. c. 30 ) and asses (Plut. Demosth. c. 27) as food for invalids. It was on goats' milk that Jupiter was reared as an infant (Manil. Astron. I. $3^{64}$ sqq.).

Compare the rearing of the infant Camilla (Virg. Aen. II. 570 sqq.). But Aristotle is recommending the use of milk not merely in the case of sucklings, who indeed must use it, but in the case of children generally, or at any rate of children under three or thereabouts. The great physical strength of the Suebi was due in part to their use of milk (Caesar, Bell. Gall. 4. 1. 8 sq.). In the early days of ancient Greece infants were sometimes given honey, not milk (Schol. Aristoph. Thesm. 506). Phoenix gave the infant Achilles wine (Hom. Il. 9.489), and it was probably commonly given to infants (Dio Chrys. Or. 4. I55 R, خै où oïє $\lambda \epsilon$ ' $\gamma \epsilon \iota \nu$ aùròv
 ôvழ kaì $\sigma \iota \tau i o t s ;$ ), but Hippocrates (De Aere, Aquis, Locis, vol. i.

 source of stone in the bladder was thus removed. According to Hist. An. 7. 12. 588 a 3 sqq., wine sometimes produced convulsions in infants ( $\beta \lambda a \beta \epsilon \rho o ̀ \nu ~ \delta o ̀ ̀ ~ \pi \rho o ̀ ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \pi a ́ \theta o s ~ k a i ̀ ~ o ́ ~ o i ̉ v o s ~ o ́ ~ \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda a s ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu ~$



 Compare also Plato, Laws 666 A and 672 B (together with Aristot. Rhet. 2. 12. 1389 a 19), and Athen. Deipn. 429 b.
8. '̈т兀 $\delta \dot{\epsilon}$ к.т.ג., ' and further it is of advantage to have all the movements made [of the bodies of infants] that it is possible to have made in the case of creatures so young.' T $\eta \lambda \iota \kappa о$ и́т $\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$ I take
 with $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \epsilon$ ' $\epsilon$. Aristotle has before him Plato, Theaet. 153 A , and






 4, but probably also $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu ~ a v ้ \xi \eta \sigma \iota v$ (cp. 34 sqq.); perhaps indeed in other ways too (cp. Plato, Laws 790 C sqq.).
10. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ ~ \mu \grave{~} \delta \iota \alpha \sigma \tau \rho \in ́ \phi \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ к . \tau . \lambda . ~ C p . ~ D e ~ G e n . ~ A n . ~ 4 . ~ 6 . ~$.


recommended the use of swathing－bands，it would seem，during the whole of the first two years of life（Laws 789 E ），though at Sparta they were not used at all（Plut．Lycurg．c．16）and the general Greek custom（according to Blümner，Home Life of the Ancient Greeks，Eng．Trans．，p． 80 sq．）probably was to drop them at the end of the fourth month．Plato had also advised with the same object in view that the unfortunate nurse should carry the child in her arms till he was three years old（see above on 8）．Aristotle is silent as to all this；he apparently hopes to secure the same result by adopting from barbarian nations the use of certain öpyava $\mu \eta \chi a v i \alpha \dot{\alpha}$ ，which kept the body of the infant from being twisted． What these instruments were，it is difficult to say．Vict．compares the＇serperastra＇of Varro，Ling．Lat．9．5，which were knee－splints or knee－bandages for straightening the crooked legs of children． As to the swaddling－clothes used，see Blümner，Home Life of the Ancient Greeks，Eng．Trans．，p． 79 sq．

$\sigma u \mu \phi \epsilon ́ \rho \epsilon \iota \quad \delta \epsilon ̀$ к．т．$\lambda$ ．The Spartans and Cretans sought to make their youth indifferent to heat and cold，but they do not seem to have begun their discipline in this respect as early in life as Aristotle recommends（see above on 1336 a 3 sqq．）．As to its impor－ tance，see 8 （6）．4．I319a 22 sqq．and Fragm．Trag．Gr．Adesp． 46 I （Nauck）．

15．Sıò mapà mo入入oîs к．т．入．See Göttling＇s note，and that of
 p． $5_{1}$ Kühn），Strabo，p． 165 ，where we read of the Iberian women，
 $\pi \rho o ́ s ~ \pi \iota ~ \rho \in \in i \theta \rho o \nu$ ，and Virg．Aen．9．603，

Durum ab stirpe genus，natos ad flumina primum
Deferimus，saevoque gelu duramus et undis．
See also the note of Leutsch and Schneidewin，Paroem．Gr． 2. p． 569 ，on the Greek proverb，＇O＇Pî̀vos éné $\gamma \chi \epsilon \iota$ tòv $\nu \dot{\prime} \theta o \nu$ ，who quote Julian，Epist．r6．p． 383 D（cp．Or．2．p．81 D sq．），whence it appears that the dipping of the new－born babe in the Rhine was used as a test of its legitimacy，spurious offspring being held to sink and legitimate offspring to swim．They also refer to Valerius Flaccus， Argonaut．6．335，where we read of the Scythians on the Phasis，

Nunquam has hiemes，haec saxa relinquam，
Martis agros，ubi iam saevo duravimus amne
Progeniem natosque rudes．
VOL．III．

They remark that neither Aristotle, who was, so far as they know, the first to refer to the custom, nor Galen says a word as to the use of the practice as a test of legitimacy. A few other references to a similar custom may be noted. Zeus was believed to have been dipped at his birth in the river Lusius, which flows through the Arcadian Gortyna and is the coldest of rivers (Paus. 8. 28). Thetis sought to make Achilles immortal by dipping him as an infant in the Styx, and the Styx was very cold (Hes. Theog. 785 sq.). 'The modern Beloochees plunge the new-born infant into a tub of snow-water' (Prof. Ridgeway, Trans. Camb. Philol. Soc. 2. 147). Compare also the proverb (Schol. Aristoph. Vesp. 1189),

## 

The Lacedaemonian practice was to bathe the infant after birth not in water, but in wine ; this was held to be strengthening to healthy children (Plut. Lycurg. c. 16). Were all these customs connected with the wide-spread custom of infant baptism, which Mr. Whitley Stokes (Academy, Feb. 15, 1896) traces 'among the heathen Norsemen, the heathen Celts, two unconverted West African tribes, and lastly the Mexicans before the arrival of the Spaniards,' referring also to 'the cases mentioned by Prof. Tylor in his Primitive Culture, third edition, vol. ii. pp. 430-433'? 'Aтоßánтelv, 'to dip completely': see above on 1335 b i4, à по 0 eparetiav.
17. тoîs $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т.д. A $\sigma \kappa$ ќтaбда is a mere protection against cold, something much less elaborate than an ifítıov. The Spartan youth were allowed an ipátov, though only one (Xen. Rep. Lac. 2.4). Some modern physicians give very different advice. 'In infancy parents above all should not make the mistake of letting their infants be too thinly clad. . . . It was a monstrous mistake for parents to send out their children with bare necks and heads and bare legs. Children ought to be clothed from head to foot winter and summer' (Dr. Corfield, Address to Sanitary Institute, Times, Sept. 30, 1889).
18. $\pi$ d́vta $\gamma$ àp к.r.... Two interpretations of these words are possible. Lamb. translates, 'omnibus enim rebus quibus assuefieri possunt, statim ab ineunte aetate eos assuefacere melius est, dummodo sensim ac paulatim'; thus he takes mávra to refer not to the beings which are to be habituated, but to the things to which they are to be habituated ; and so Sus. ' zu Allem, wozu man Kinder überhaupt gewöhnen kann.' But it is also possible, and perhaps
simpler, to translate đápra ốa סuvaròv é $\begin{aligned} & \text { íçelv 'all things that are }\end{aligned}$ susceptible of habituation.' I am not sure whether I am right in inferring from the passages with which Bonitz (Ind. s. v. éeic $k \in \nu$ ) groups that before us that he takes the words in this sense. He refers, however, in the preceding line to Eth. Nic. 2. I. 1103 a 19 23 and Eth. Eud. 2. 2. 1220 b I, where we learn that not all things are susceptible of habituation. The bodily habit of children, Aristotle goes on in 20 to tell us, is susceptible of habituation to cold. Mév here, as often elsewhere (Bon. Ind. s. v.), 'non ei additur vocabulo in quo vis oppositionis cernitur'; it should have followed
 Hippocrates' (Liddell and Scott) and a favourite expression with Aristotle, but it is apparently not used by Thucydides, or Xenophon, or Plato, or (in the sense at least in which it is used here) by the Attic Orators. Compare for the thought Hist. An. 6. 12. 567 a 5 sqq. and Xen. Cyrop. 6. 2. 29, and for the turn of the sentence
 $\delta \iota \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i v$.

 872 a 6 , oi ठè $\pi$ aîôes íypoì кai $\theta \epsilon \rho \mu o i$ : also Plato, Laws 664 E and 666 A . This view is inherited from Hippocrates: cp. Hippocr.

 1333 b $3^{8 .}$
 See note on 1281 a 26. The phrase occurs in Pindar, Nem. 9. $4^{2}$

 but in a wider sense than in the passage before us, where it appears to refer to the first two or three years of life.
 period of life till five should be dealt with in a different manner, the child being now encouraged to play games, but his sentence breaks down in course of utterance, for $\Pi^{1} P^{4.5 .}$ Bekk. are probably wrong in omitting $\delta \epsilon, 26$, which is needed to contrast $\delta \epsilon i$ rooraúrns


 7 (5). 4.1304 a 14 sqq. For the thought, cp. Plato, Laws 793 E,
 סє́ov à e ein. For the child of six, however, Aristotle finds other occupation in 1336 b 35 sqq . Children under five are regarded by him as too young to be put to any study ; it is not till seven that under his scheme of education children begin to learn what the gymnastic trainer and the $\pi a \delta \delta o r p i \beta \eta s$ can teach them (5 (8). 3 . r 338 b 6 sqq.), nor till after puberty apparently that they learn their letters (5 (8). 4. 1339 a 4 sqq.); among ourselves, on the contrary, to say nothing of the Kindergarten, children are taught their letters before five. The effect of hard physical labour in injuring growth is referred to in 5 (8). 4. 1338 b io sq. Cp.


 not quite agree with the last sentence; he thinks that from two or three to five children should have nothing to do with $\gamma$ vuváasa involving àvaykaiot đóvol, but he does not agree that they should have no rvuváoua at that age, but only stories. He provides a kind of gymnastic training for them in their pastimes and also in their
 because they check physical growth (cp. 5 (8). 4. I 338 b 40 sqq.), and any checking of physical growth is especially out of place in the first five years of life, inasmuch as physical growth is the main business of these years; in fact, according to Plato, Laws 788 D , the human being grows in height during them as much as he does





 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \grave{a} \rho \gamma^{\prime} a \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, cp. Plato, Theaet. ${ }_{53}$ B (quoted above on 1336 a 8).

 than the ä̀ $\lambda a \iota \tau \pi a \dot{\xi} \epsilon \epsilon s$ ) 'should be neither unbefitting for freemen nor laborious nor relaxed and effeminate.' Aristotle probably has




Greece were no doubt often faulty in the ways referred to by Aristotle. He has hitherto been concerned almost, if not quite, exclusively with the training of the body, which precedes that of the öpe $\xi_{t s}$ (c. 15.1334 b 25 sqq.), but now he begins to provide for the training of the öpe $\xi t s$, and here, as in 1336 b 2 sqq., he seeks to
 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi เ \pi$ óvous, because toilsome games will check the growth of the body (cp. 25). Míte àvépévas, Vict. ' neque remissas nimis atque enervatas': for the contrast of ėmitóvous and àvę $\mu$ évus, cp. 2. 6. 1265 a 33 sq.
30. кai $\pi \epsilon р i ̀ ~ \lambda o ́ y \omega v ~ \delta e ̀ ~ к a i ~ \mu u ́ \theta \omega v ~ к . т . \lambda . ~ A r i s t o t l e ~ h a s ~ j u s t ~ s a i d ~$ by implication that the nature of the games which children over three should play is a matter to be attended to by those in authority, and now he adds the remark, 'Yes, and with regard to tales true and fictitious also,' etc. He here has before him Plato,



 Phaedo 61 B, where Stallbaum remarks, 'tenendum est $\lambda$ óyov esse vocabulum generis atque significare quamcunque orationem et narrationem, sive veram sive fictam ; sed interdum, ubi opponitur $\mu \hat{\imath}$ Oos, de narratione vera usurpari solet.' ^óyos is thus used in opposition to $\mu \hat{\imath}$ Oos in Laws 872 D, Gorg. 523 A, Protag. 320 C, Tim. 26 E . It is probable therefore that $\pi \epsilon \rho i \lambda{ }^{\prime} \hat{o}^{\gamma} \omega \nu$ кai $\mu \nu \dot{\partial} \theta \omega \nu$ in the passage before us means 'with regard to tales true and fictitious' (Sus. 'Erzählungen und Märchen'), though it should be noted that Vahlen (Beiträge zu Aristoteles Poetik, I. 34) does not take this view and regards $\lambda$ óyou and $\mu \hat{\nu} \theta_{o t}$ here as synonymous, no less than in Poet. 5. 1449 b 8, where he interprets ' $\lambda$ óyous id est $\mu \dot{\prime}$ Oows.' Aristotle is as careful as Plato (Rep. 377 B sq., 38 I E) not to leave it to the uncontrolled discretion of mothers and nurses what tales are told to children, but his object seems to be to exclude tales which do not prepare the way for the pursuits of after-lifetales simply frivolous and amusing, for instance, or unsuitable to future soldiers and citizens-rather than tales giving a false impression of the gods, which were those specially objected to by Plato. Does Aristotle intend any kind of religious instruction to be conveyed through these $\lambda$ órou kaì $\mu \hat{\imath} \theta o u$ ? If not, he does not seem to provide for any religious element in the education of youth.
32. $\pi \alpha \dot{\alpha} \tau \tau \alpha$ тà тolaûta, 'all the things we have mentioned,' $\pi a \iota \delta \delta a i$, $\lambda o ́ \gamma o t, \mu \nu \hat{\theta} \circ \stackrel{\text {. }}{ }$
33. $\delta \iota o ̀ ~ \tau \grave{s} \pi \alpha \iota \delta \iota \alpha ̀ s ~ k . \tau . \lambda . ~ T h i s ~ i s ~ b a s e d ~ o n ~ P l a t o, ~ L a w s ~ 643 ~ B, ~$ a passage which is probably present to Aristotle's mind in Poet. 4.


 Cretan lawgiver had already studied this (Ephor. Fragm. 64:

 $\pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu о \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \sigma i \mu \omega \nu)$, and a saying was ascribed to Anacharsis, $\pi a i \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ $\delta \epsilon i ̂$, ö $\pi \omega s$ $\sigma \pi o v \delta \alpha^{\sigma} \sigma \eta s$ (Mullach, Fr. Philos. Gr. 1. 233 : cp. Eth. Nic. 10. 6. 1176 b 33). Achilles as a child of six years had according to Pindar (Nem. 3.43 sqq.) 'made mighty deeds his play.' The Tencteri learnt in the sports of childhood to become the formidable cavalry they proved themselves (Tac. Germ. c. $3^{2}$ ). See also vol. i. p. 350, note 3, and cp. Plut. Sympos. 2. 5. 2 imit . Aristotle wishes the pastimes even of infancy to be a preparation for the life of the soldier and the citizen. Many of the games played by Greek children were 'games of imitation': on this class of games see Becq de Fouquières, Jeux des Anciens, p. 63 sqq., where the games of 'the King,' 'the Judge,' and 'the Architect' are described. Children's mimicries of riding, driving, building, and nursing are familiar enough to ourselves. The ways of Themistocles and of Cato of Utica as children in the matter of games may be studied in Plut. Themist. c. 2 and Cato c. I. The late Rev. C. Kingsley is said to have preached to an audience of chairs at four years old. ' Even the games to which the little Chinese are addicted are always impregnated with the mercantile spirit; they amuse themselves with keeping shop and opening little pawnbroking establishments, and familiarize themselves with the jargon, the tricks, and the frauds of tradesmen ' (Huc's Chinese Empire, Eng. Trans., 2. 149). These are exactly the sort of games which Aristotle would wish his infant citizen not to play.
34. tàs $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ §ıaтáaєıs к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle here passes naturally enough from $\pi a \iota \delta a i$, one means of producing movement, to
 doing so. He had said in 25 that àvaүкaîo $\pi$ тóvot must be avoided in the years from two or three to five because they interfere with the growth of the body, and now he tells us that the daatá⿱ets kai
${ }_{\kappa \lambda} \lambda u \theta \mu \mathrm{oi}$ which he declines to follow others in checking are not open to this objection，for they contribute to the growth of the body．Thus they are in place at this age，while the àvaүkaio móvo
 cp．Laws 791 Esqq．，where he follows a Spartan tradition，for the nurses at Sparta sought to check fretfulness and crying in infants （Plut．Lycurg．c．16）．Plato is apparently speaking of new－born babes（ 79 I D），and this might tempt us to transpose（with Sus．and
 $\psi v \chi \rho \omega \hat{\nu}$ ä $\sigma \eta \sigma v \nu$ ，so as to group 34－39 with the part of the chapter which deals with infants（though even there the paragraph would not be in place，for it ought to follow the discussion of kevígets and
 from raiotai to òará⿱乛龰匕ts is natural and easy，and，as I have pointed out，there is an evident reference in $34-39$ to ${ }^{2} 5$ ，oüte $\pi \rho$ òs àvayкaious $\pi o ́ v o v s, ~ \ddot{\pi} \pi \omega s ~ \mu \grave{\eta} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ aü $\xi \eta \sigma t \nu \dot{\epsilon} \mu \pi \pi \delta i \grave{\zeta} \omega \sigma \tau \nu$ ．I am therefore against any transposition．For the thought，cp．Plut．Sympos．6．I．i，aủróv


 in Attic Prose＇（Liddell and Scott）．

37．yivetal yàp k．т．．．，＇for they come to be in a way exercise for the body［and exercise makes the body grow］＇：cp．Probl．21．I4．





 breath［which accompanies exertion］that produces strength in those who labour［and therefore serves the same end as exercise］， and this＇（i．e．the holding of the breath）＇happens to children also when they exert themselves in crying［no less than to men taking exercise］．＇With Bonitz（Ind．rgoa 3r）I take $\begin{gathered} \\ \text { g to refer to } \dot{\eta} \tau o \hat{v}\end{gathered}$ $\pi \nu \in \dot{v} \mu a \tau o s ~ k a ́ \theta \in \xi t s ~ o n l y, ~ a n d ~ n o t ~ t o ~ t h e ~ w h o l e ~ o f ~ t h e ~ p r e c e d i n g ~ s e n-~$ tence．For the use of $\delta$ dateive $\theta \neq a t$ here of straining which involves the holding of the breath，Bonitz compares Probl．19． 15.918 b 14 ，



kai $\mu \mathrm{ei}$ íov $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ avví⿴囗ous．As to the effect of holding the breath

 An．2． 4.737 b 35 sqq．，and 4.6 .775 a 37 sqq．Tìv ioxúv，not



 their time．＇$\Delta a \operatorname{ar} \omega \gamma^{\prime}$ is here used in a wider sense than the special one in which（in 5 （8）．5．1339a 29）it is denied to children．
 sentence looks as if it was intended to run $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \tau^{\prime} a ̈ \lambda \lambda \eta \nu$ кai $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon \tau \grave{a}$ סoúd $\omega \nu$ and was only finished as it stands by an afterthought．For the thought，compare the saying of Isocrates（［Plut．，］Decem


 Gr．3．85）．At Sparta $\pi a \iota 0 a \gamma \omega \gamma o i$ were dispensed with（see Plutarch， Lycurg．c． 16 ，and vol．i．p． $35^{1}$ ，note 2）．But Aristotle is speaking here of an earlier age than that at which boys were commonly provided with $\pi a \iota \delta a \gamma \omega \gamma o i-t h e y$ would hardly have $\pi a \iota \delta a \gamma \omega \gamma o i$ till they went to school at seven－and he must be thinking rather of slave－nurses and of the slaves，male and female，about the house with whom the child was likely to come in contact．At Rome in its early days，according to Tac．Dial．de Orat．c．28，＇suus cuique filius，ex casta parente natus，non in cella emptae nutricis sed gremio ac sinu matris educabatur．＇The mother of Leopardi kept her children as much as possible out of the company of servants （see Macmillan＇s Magazine，vol．56，p．90）．Aristotle is evidently afraid that children under seven may pick up àvedevetpia and aioxpo－入oria from the slaves about them，male and female．It must have taken imported slaves generally some little time to learn to speak Greek：even those employed as nurses and $\pi a \iota \delta a \gamma \omega y o$ ，though they would commonly speak better Greek than most slaves，probably often spoke the language imperfectly（cp．Plato，Lysis 223 A ）： still they would speak it well enough to be occasionally guilty of aioxpòо oyia．

 Bon．Ind．ro9 b 44 sqq．，where among other passages Eth．Nic．
 $\tau \hat{\varphi} \epsilon \notin \delta \epsilon \epsilon \iota \geqslant$ 'à $\phi^{\prime} \omega \nu$, is quoted. See notes on 1330 b 10 and 1334 b 12 for other cases of the omission of the article. It was not till the age of seven that the Spartan boy was placed in an $\dot{a} \gamma \epsilon \lambda \eta \eta$ (Plut. Lycurg. c. 16), and this was the age at which the Athenian boy began to resort to a $\gamma \rho a \mu \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta$ 's and a $\pi a \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s$ ([Plato,] Axioch. 366 D sq.), and the Persian boy to a riding-master (Alcib. I. 12 I E), though Herodotus (I. I36) makes Persian education begin at five. Plato, on the other hand, in the Laws (794) had brought children from three to six years old together for games at the village-temples.
2. єử $\lambda$ oyov oûv к.т.入. The meaning is that, as children under 1336 b. seven must be reared at home, where there are slaves and where illiberality of mind may easily be learnt, it is reasonable to expect that even at that early age they may acquire a taint of illiberality from what they see and hear. 'A $\lambda \epsilon \lambda \in v \theta \in \rho i a$ is used here in a wide and popular sense, not in the narrow and technical sense of $\dot{a} \nu \epsilon \lambda \in v-$

 being, ' we banish indecent language altogether from the State, but if we do not entirely succeed in accomplishing that, and any person should be found saying or doing anything that we prohibit, then' etc. For the intervening $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu$ oủv, 6 , occurring by way of correction in the middle of a sentence, cp. Rhet. 2. 9. 1387 a 32 ,


 probably also does in Eth. Nic. 10. IO. 1180 a 9, rov̀s $\delta^{\circ}$ ảvıátovs
 note on 1255 a 2 I . For $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \in \rho$ ä $\lambda \lambda \lambda_{o} \tau \iota$ ('more than anything else'), cp. 7 (5). 8. I3O7 b 3 r. Aristotle passes on from àve $\lambda_{\epsilon v} \theta_{\epsilon}$.

 probably has before him a saying of Democritus recorded in [Plut.]



 The sons of the ópóт $\mu$ ot of Cyrus in the Cyropaedeia of Xenophon are described as brought up at his court aï $\chi \rho \dot{o} \nu \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \mu \eta \delta \dot{\delta} \varphi \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \dot{\delta} \rho \hat{\rho} \nu \tau \epsilon s$ $\mu \eta \dot{\tau} \epsilon$ ảkov́outєs (Xen. Cyrop. 7.5.86). Some may ask why Aristotle
does not banish comedy, in which airxponoyia was common, from the State. That he does not do so, we see from 1336 b 20 . The reason is that those below a certain age will be forbidden to witness comedy, and that those above it will be protected from injury by the education they have received ( 1336 b 20 sqq .).
6. $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha \mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oûv ėk têv $\nu \in ́ \omega \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle has before him Plato, Laws 729 B.
9. As to ảmךүорєu $\mu \in ́ v \omega v$, see Liddell and Scott, and Veitch, Greek Verbs Irregular and Defective, s.v. ả $\gamma \circ \rho \in \dot{v} \omega$.
 As to the age at which the young freeman was allowed to recline, instead of sitting, at meals, cp. 21 sqq. The age intended may be twenty-one (cp. 1336 b 37 sqq .). It was probably at this age that the young Spartan became a member of one of the фьסitia (Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., p. 66. 2). Sus. ${ }^{2}$ (Note 966: Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. 558), however, regards the change as occurring in the seventeenth year, when the youths, as he believes (cp. 5 (8). 4. I 339 a 4 sqq.), begin to have syssitia of their own, though he allows that, as they remain outside the general syssitia till twentyone, катák $\iota \iota \sigma \iota s$ will not commence for them there till that age.
 will not allow any of his citizens to share in $\mu \mu^{\prime} \theta \eta$ till forty, but it is not likely that Aristotle intended to be equally strict.
10. àтцрíaıs кода́धєเу каì $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \alpha i ̂ s . ~ N o t ~ w i t h ~ b l o w s ~ o n l y, ~ l i k e ~$ a slave, but with indignities and blows combined-the former because the offender is a freeman (cp. Demosth. De Chersoneso,


 latter because he is under age (cp. Plato, Laws 700 C , $\pi$ aıfì $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ кaì
 $\nu \in \tau 0$ ). We read in Laws 72 I B of offenders who are to be mulcted хрๆ́цагí $\tau \in \kappa$ каì àтıцía. Freemen of full age, on the other hand, were to be punished árıpiaus áve $\lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon ́ \rho o \iota s$, i. e. with indignities usually inflicted not on freemen but on slaves. There were átıuia not àve $\lambda \epsilon \dot{v} \theta \in \rho o t$, such as the withdrawal of political rights. In Laws
 humiliating punishments (Diod. 12. 16. 1). See on the subject Prof. Sidgwick, Elements of Politics, ed. i, p. in6.


Iambi and comedy are evidently referred to (cp. 20 sqq.). Prof. W. Christ (Gesch. der griech. Litteratur, p. 167.4) takes $\lambda$ óyot here to mean 'dialogue,' comparing the expression $\lambda$ óyou $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a t \iota к o i$ for Socratic Dialogues (see also Bon. Ind. 433 b 3 sqq.), but Aristotle must have objected to indecent monologue as much as to indecent dialogue. In speaking of the class of mimes called $\pi$ aiyua, Plutarch (Sympos. 7. 8. 4) remarks, oi $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ пo $\boldsymbol{\lambda} \lambda \frac{1}{}$ (i.e. most of those who



ėmı $\mu \in \lambda$ ès $\mu$ èv oûv к.т. $\lambda$. Oỏvv here contains an inference, as in c. 16. 1335 b 8 and in I. I. $125^{2}$ a 7.
roîs äpxouqu, not the paedonomi probably, but rather the astynomi and agronomi (cp. 8 (6). 8. I3 2 I b i 8 sqq.).
15. $\mu \eta \delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \mu \dot{\eta} \tau \epsilon \not{ }^{\text {aly }}{ }^{\alpha \lambda \mu \alpha}$ к.т.. ., ' that there is no image or picture representing indecent scenes' (Welldon).

тоooút $\omega \nu$, i.e. à $\sigma \chi \eta \mu{ }^{2} \nu \omega \nu$. Pictures and statues representing indecent acts or scenes must evidently have been visible in Greek cities, especially, it would seem, in connexion with the gods in whose worship $\tau \omega \theta a \sigma \mu \sigma^{\prime}$ s was used. It is not probably to the familiar Hermae that Aristotle objects, but rather to pictures and statues representing such subjects as the drunkenness of Dionysus:



 Others perhaps represented the amours of Zeus.
 rility,' see Grote, Hist. of Greece, 4. 108, note (Part 2, c. 29): C. F. Hermann, Gr. Ant. 2. § 29. 3 (who refers to Paus. 7. 27. 10), 2. §56. 14, and 2. § 57. 20 : Toepffer, Attische Genealogie, p. 93 foot. Compare also Athen. Deipn. $622 \mathrm{a}-\mathrm{d}$, and the unfavourable view expressed by Xenocrates, the contemporary head of the Academy, of the gods in whose worship $\tau \omega \theta a \sigma \mu \rho^{\prime}$ was resorted to







Orac. c. 14. 417 C). Among the gods to whom Aristotle here refers are Dionysus, Demeter, and Corê (C. F. Hermann ibid.). But other gods also were thus worshipped, for instance Apollo Aeglêtês in Anaphê (Conon, ap. Phot. Biblioth. Cod. r86. p. 141 b

 the $\tau \omega \theta a \sigma \mu$ ós was addressed by the worshippers to each other in commemoration of the jests exchanged between Medea and her attendant women on the one side and the Argonauts on the other, when the Argo was driven by a tempest to Anaphê. Kai $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \tau \omega \theta a \sigma \mu o ́ v$, 'scurrilous jeering also,' as well as indecent statues and pictures. 'O עóros, probably an unwritten law, like that referred to in C. 12. 1331 a 26 sqq.
17. тро̀s $\delta \grave{\text { è тоútots к.т. } \lambda ., \text { ' and in addition to this the law allows }}$ them to do honour to the gods on behalf both of themselves and of their wives and children.' Cp. Cato, De Re Rustica, c. 143, rem divinam (villica) ne faciat, neve mandet qui pro ea faciat, iniussu domini aut dominae. Scito dominum pro tota familia rem divinam facere. A saying of Pythagoras recorded in Diod. 10. 9. 7 is in a somewhat similar spirit, öть ó aủтòs (i.e. ПuӨayópas) àmєфaivero тoís

 Laws 909 D Plato goes farther and confines sacrificing, as distinguished from prayer, to priests and priestesses, ois áyveia тоv́tшע $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \tau \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ 's. Ti $\mu a \lambda \phi \epsilon i \nu$ (a poetical word, 'rare in Prose,' see Liddell and Scott) refers probably especially to sacrifices. For кaì vit̀p

20. roùs $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \in \omega \tau \in ́ \rho o u s$ к.т. $\lambda$. Here Aristotle goes on to protect

 iá $\mu \beta \omega$ к.т. $\lambda$. Iambi are iambic verses, often abusive and indecent
 Dionysus in which the phallus was introduced (Poet. 4. 1449 a $9^{-13}$ ). It was from iambi of this kind that comedy took its rise (Poet. 4. 1448 b 24-I 449 a I 5, and esp. 24 sqq. and I 449 a 2 sqq.). Iambi, however, did not pass away on the rise of comedy; we hear, in fact, that they were particularly popular at Syracuse (Athen. Deipn. 18i c). Iambi and comedy had this in common that they dealt in $\psi$ óyos (cp. Hor. Carm. I. 16. 2, criminosis iambis), hence they are often named together, e.g. in Plato, Laws 935. E.

Whether Aristotle includes under iambi mimes written in iambic verse, like those of Herondas, it is difficult to say. As to comedy, compare Plato's views in Laws 816 D sqq. The satyr-play which was added at the close of a tragic trilogy often contained indecent passages, but it does not seem to have been open to as much objection as comedy (Blümner, Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, Eng. Trans., p. 447), and it probably savoured less of $\psi$ ózos and $\delta v \sigma \mu e ́ v e c a$. It appears to be certain that boys were present at representations both of tragedy and of comedy at Athens (A. Müller, Die griech. Bühnenalt. p. 292. 1). The bigger boys were very fond of comedy and older lads of tragedy (Plato, Laws 658 D). As

 must not legislate that the young shall be [admissible as] spectators of either iambi or comedy.'
 $\pi \rho i \nu \eta ँ$ with the aor. subj. without ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu$, cp. 6 (4). 4 . 129 I a 19 sqq. and other passages collected by Bonitz, Ind. 633 a 2 sqq. Kaissling (Tempora und Modi in des Aristoteles Politica und in der Atheniensium Politia, p. 54) points out that $\pi \rho i \nu \eta$ च with the aorist subjunctive is not here preceded by où $\pi \rho o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho \circ \nu$, as it is in 6 (4). 4. 1291 a 19 sqq. and 7 (5). $11.13^{1} 4^{\text {a }}$ I 7 sqq.
22. Tต̂v тotoút $\omega v$, i. e. iambi and comedy.
24. The Index Aristotelicus ( 608 b 30 ) gives no other instance
 but compare for the absence of $\pi \in \rho i$ c. 10. 1330 a 22,6 (4). 4.

 ${ }_{\epsilon ̀ \nu}^{\epsilon} \pi a \rho a \delta \rho o \mu \bar{\eta}$ (245b 36). 'Ev $\pi a \rho a \delta \rho \rho \mu \hat{\eta}$ seems to be a rare expression.


 тоӥто $\nu_{\circ} \mu_{0} \theta_{\epsilon \tau \epsilon i v}$, i. e. by what provisions of law the exclusion of the $\nu$ עє́тepot will best be effected.
26. катà $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ тòv паро́vта кацрòv к.т..., 'but in relation to the present occasion we have touched on it only in the way in which it was necessary to touch on it.' For the suppression of 'only,' see note on 1282 a 36 . Compare also Meteor. 3. 4.374 b 17 , $\nu \hat{\nu} \nu$



27. 'īws $\gamma$ à к.т.ג., 'for perhaps Theodorus, the actor of tragedy, said not ill that which has just been said.' 「áp introduces an explanation why it is not necessary for Aristotle to say more ; Theodorus, in fact, had by his remark done much to solve the problem and to indicate the true course. Camerarius, however, asks, not without reason (Interp. p. 332), 'Quod vero hoc dictum est? Factum enim magis exponitur histrionis. Nisi aliquis coniecturam de eo capere dicto posse videatur. Aut libeat suspicari


 should probably be explained as Coray explains it, but, as Sus. ${ }^{3}$ says, ' $\epsilon \lambda \epsilon \gamma \epsilon$ haud sine causa offendit Camerarium.' The only substitute for it which has occurred to me is $\epsilon \lambda v \epsilon$ ('gave not ill a practical solution of the question which has just been mentioned'). For $\dot{o}$ т $\eta$ s $\tau \rho a \gamma \varphi \delta i a s ~ \dot{v} \pi о к \rho \iota \tau \eta$ 's, which is added to distinguish this Theodorus from others of the same name, cp. Dittenberger, Syll. Inscr. Gr. No. 417 , íтокрıг̀̀s т $\rho a \gamma[\omega \iota \delta i a s]$, Athen. Deipn. 407 d,

 'Aєрómク, As to Theodorus, see Meineke, Hist. Crit. Com. Gr. p. $5^{23}$, and Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 968 (Sus. ${ }^{4}$, I. p. $55^{8}$ ), and cp. Rhet. 3. 2. 1404 b 22 sqq., where the naturalness and charm of his voice are dwelt upon. He was one of the best tragic actors of the time immediately before that of Aristotle. How could Theodorus avoid being preceded by other actors on the stage, if he did not always take the part, perhaps an insignificant one, to which the first speech of the tragedy was assigned ? Richards asks, 'Did he insist, when plays were competing, on being protagonist in the first, so that no other protagonist might win over the audience before him? Or does the statement about him refer to occasions when actors only (not plays or choruses) were competing, and when perhaps only scenes or single speeches were recited? See Haigh's Attic Theatre, p. 58.' Demosthenes acted in much the same way as Theodorus did, when he insisted on being heard by Philip of Macedon first of the Athenian envoys (Aeschin. De Fals. Leg.



 $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ трокаталацßаขóvт $\omega \nu$ ．

29．oủסєv̀̀ үà к．т．入．Eíáyєเข is commonly used of the poet or chorêgus bringing the chorus on the stage（as in Aristoph．Acharn．
 freedom of the actors bringing on the stage the parts represented by them（W．Christ，Gesch．der griech．Litteratur，p．I7I．2）．
 friendly to＇（or＇won to the side of＇）＇what it hears first．＇Liddell



31．$\sigma u \mu \beta a i v \epsilon \iota$ סє̀ к．т．ג．，＇and this same thing happens both in relation to dealings with men，［which is what Theodorus had in view，］and in relation to dealings with things．＇For $\pi \rho o{ }^{\prime}$ ，cp． 38 ， and 5 （8）．2．1337 b 3．For тàs $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ ó $\mu \iota \lambda i ́ a s, ~ c p . ~ E u r i p . ~$ Phoen． 1329 Bothe（ 1408 Dindorf），$\delta \mu i \lambda i a ́ \chi \theta o v o ́ s . ~$

33．$\pi \alpha ́ v \tau \alpha ~ \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \gamma \circ \mu \in \nu \tau \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho \hat{\omega} \tau \alpha \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v$ ，＇for whatever we first have to do with，we like better than anything else，＇so that if iambi and comedy are witnessed in youth，they will be among the things liked best．Aristotle has before him Plato，Rep． 378 D ，ó үà $\rho$ ע́éos


 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̀ \rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ákov́єıv．Compare Hor．Epist．1．2． 69 and familiar sayings like＇on revient toujours à ses premiers amours＇and＇the child is father of the man．＇＇The Jesuits used to say，＂Give me a child till he is seven years old，and I will make him what no one will unmake＂＇（Miss E．Welldon in the Cheltenham Ladies＇College Magazine，No．18，p．179）．We may also explain in this way the tendency of men，as they grow old，to become＇laudatores temporis acti．＇On the other hand，there is truth in Hom．Odyss．1．351，


Sıò $\delta \in \hat{\imath}$ к．т．入．Moteì $\xi \in \varepsilon v a$ ，＇to make strange and unknown，＇in opposition to oiкєเov $\boldsymbol{\epsilon}^{\prime} \nu \omega \nu$, 30．Pythagoras（ap．Aristox．Fragm． 20 ： Müller，Fr．Hist．Gr．2．279）shows a similar desire to keep the young from all knowledge of evil．It was in a somewhat different sense that Antisthenes said（Diog．Laert．6．12），тà $\pi 0 \nu \eta \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi a ́ \nu \tau a$ ขó $\mu \iota \zeta \in \mathfrak{\xi} \in \nu ⿺ 𠃊 \alpha ́$.
 $a u ̀ \tau \hat{\nu} \nu=\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \phi a \hat{\nu} \lambda \omega \nu$ ，it is clear that in Aristotle＇s view a thing might


 Bòaí．We see from Eth．Nic．6．13．1144 a 34，ס九aбтрє́ $\phi$ et yàp
 term $\mu$ ox $\theta$ npia is．Aristotle probably regards iambi and comedy as not free from elements of depravity and malignity．$\Delta v \sigma \mu e ́ v e ́ a \nu$ ，the reading of $\Pi$ Bekk．（as to the rendering of Vet．Int．see critical note on 1336 b 35），seems to be perfectly right，though Sus．would read $\delta v a y^{\prime}$ éeav in place of it．Aristotle probably has before him Plato，Laws 934 D－936 A，where iambi and comedy are connected with ${ }_{\chi}^{\chi} \theta \rho \rho a, \beta \lambda a \sigma \phi \eta \mu i a$ ，and какпүорia，and Phileb． $48 \mathrm{~A}-{ }_{5} \circ \mathrm{~A}$ ，where envy is implied to be an ingredient in comedy，for envy is nearly
 in Plato，Rep． 500 C，Phaedr． 253 B，and Protag． 316 D．Compare
入oyoùvaas，and Plut．Non posse suaviter vivi secundum Epicurum，


 his best in the Laws（ $792 \mathrm{~B}, \mathrm{D}, \mathrm{E}$ ）to secure that the child shall be $\epsilon \ddot{v} \theta \nu \mu o s, i ̃ \lambda \epsilon \omega s$ ，and $\epsilon \dot{\jmath} \mu \epsilon \nu \dot{\eta} s$ ，and it is in the same mood（Rep． 496 E ）that he wishes men to close their life．This is the mood of the Olympian Gods（see above on 1332 a 9），and according to Plutarch（Pericl．c．39）it was the eijevès j $\bar{\theta} \boldsymbol{o s}$ of Pericles that justified the application to him of the epithet＇Olympian．＇

35．$\delta \iota \epsilon \lambda \theta$ óvicuv $\delta$ è к．т．入．Өєшрoús means＇spectators，＇not ＇auditores，＇as Sus．${ }^{3}$ explains the word in this passage（Ind．s．v．）． Aristotle gets the hint of what he here suggests from Plato，Rep．




 older boys than those whom Aristotle has in view，and war would of course not be one of the $\mu a \theta^{\prime} \eta_{\sigma \text { ts }}$ to which Aristotle refers． These $\mu a \theta_{\eta}^{\prime} \sigma e, s$ include probably gymnastic and music，especially the former．Plato in the Laws（ 794 C ）had sent boys of six to
teachers of riding and of the use of the bow, the javelin, and the sling; Aristotle sends boys at seven to the gymnastic trainer and the $\pi a \iota \delta o r p i ß \eta s$ ( 5 (8). 3. 1338 b 6 sqq.); of riding he says nothing.
 or rearing, to $\pi$ au $\delta$ éia, or education strictly so called, which is evidently conceived as beginning at seven years of age. We shall find in the sequel that, in accordance with the announcement made here, puberty forms a turning-point in the educational course, for till puberty no studies find a place in it but gymnastic, and that of the less laborious type ( $5(8) \cdot 4 \cdot \mathrm{r} 33^{8} \mathrm{~b} 40$ ), whereas after puberty other studies are to be taken in hand for three years, and then the severe kind of gymnastic is to be commenced (5 (8). 4. 1339 a 4 sqq.). That the age of twenty-one, like puberty, marks a crisis in the physiological development of the human being, we see from Hist. An. 7. 1. 582 a $16-33$. The meaning of $\mu \epsilon \tau a ́$ in 38,39 , is by no means clear, yet the commentators say nothing about it. Is Aristotle's meaning this, that a break is to occur in the education at two epochs-at the close of the period from seven years of age to puberty and at the close of the period from puberty to twenty-one, or in other words at puberty and at twenty-one? If this is so, it is manifest that Aristotle did not intend his education to cease at twenty-one, a conclusion to which other considerations also point (see vol. i. p. 370 and p. $35^{8}$, note 2 , and note on $\mathrm{r}_{333} \mathrm{~b}_{3}$ ). He apparently devotes the years intervening between three years after puberty and twenty-one to the severer kind of gymnastic training (5 (8). 4. 1339a 4 sqq.). At Athens things were arranged quite differently. Young Athenians were enrolled
 pletion of the eighteenth year ('A ${ }^{\prime}$. Под. c. 42 : the seventeenth according to Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng. Trans., pp. 197, $3^{10}$, but see Mr. R. W. Macan in Class. Rev. ro. 199 sq.), though they spent the two following years in military training, garrison-duty, and field-service as $\pi \epsilon \rho i \pi o \lambda o t$, and therefore did not discharge any strictly political functions till two years later. Aristotle does not arrange for the performance of any military service before the age of twenty-one. For $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̈ s, ~ ' i n ~ r e l a t i o n ~ t o ~$







 à «oooveciv $\tau \hat{y}$ фv́ $\sigma \epsilon t$ occurs in Plato, Laws 836 C . Plato in the Laws ( 809 E sq .) had arranged his curriculum of study without reference to puberty by periods of three years from ten to sixteen. Aristotle follows the Lacedaemonian practice: cp. Phot. ovvé $\phi \eta \beta$ os (quoted by Gilbert, Const. Antiq. of Sparta and Athens, Eng.


 à $\nu \grave{\rho} \rho \hat{0} \sigma \theta a l$.
 to complete nature, they should follow nature as far as she goes. Art seeks to complete nature because she takes the raw material furnished by nature-wool, or bricks, or human beings-and by completing what is deficient produces a garment, or a house, or a State: see Prof. Butcher, Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, ed. 2, p. 118 sq., and compare (with Eaton) Phys. 2. 8. 199 a 15 , ö $\lambda \omega$
 and (with Congreve) Eth. Nic. 1. 4. 1097 a 5 sq. The same thing is true of education, for education starts with that which is furnished by nature (c. 13.1332 a 40 sqq.: 6 (4). 11. 1295 a 27 sq.), and

 kind of education,' compare the use of madesia in the plural in Eth. Nic. 10. 10. 1180 b 7 sq., Oecon. 1. 5. 1344 a 26 sq., and Thuc. 2. 39. 2. The word $\pi \rho \sigma \pi \lambda \epsilon i \pi \epsilon \epsilon \nu$ appears to be a rare one: Liddell and

 that of education-to reach which he has been hastening forward so fast, postponing the full consideration of not a few questions, and he here resumes the use of the aporetic method, which he had laid aside since the commencement of the Fourth Book (vol. i. p. $35^{2}$ ). The first two of the questions here raised are easily answered, the first in 5 (8). I. 1337 a $1 \mathbf{1 - 2 1}$, and the second in $\mathbf{1}_{337}$ a $2 \mathbf{1}-33$, but the third question requires far fuller treatment ; the consideration of it is not completed in what we possess of the Fifth Book.
 vidually ' (cp. 5 (8). I. I337 a 24 sqq.). Aristotle has already said
 èmı
 21 sq.
8. kaì vûv, 'even now' (cp. c. 16. 1335 b 5). Even in Aristotle's day not many Greek States made the superintendence of education the concern of the State.




## BOOK V (VIII).

11. "Otı $\mu$ èv oûv k.т.入. Two reasons are given for this conclu- C. 1 . sion-(I) attention to the education of youth is demanded in the 1337 a . interest of the constitution ( $12-18$ ), and (2) it is demanded because some training is required before men can act virtuously ( $\mathbf{1 8 - 2 1 )}$ ).
12. каì үà к.т.л. Cp. 7 (5). 9. 1310 а 12-36 and 1. 13. 1260 b 13 sqq.
13. $\delta \epsilon i ̂ \gamma ~ \gamma a ̀ \rho ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ e ́ ~ e ́ x a ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu ~ \pi \alpha u \delta \epsilon u ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a l . ~ S e e ~ c r i t i c a l ~ n o t e . ~$
rò $\gamma$ àp $\hat{\eta} \theta$ os к.т.入. Here Aristotle probably has before him



 1310 a 12 sqq . that the safety of constitutions is not secured by the mere making of laws, however excellent they may be ; it is necessary to produce in the citizens the type of character which is favourable to the maintenance of the particular constitution. We

 Demosth. Ol. 3.25 sq., where it is implied that one feature of it is a willingness on the part of the leading men of the State to be content with a mode of life not more splendid than that of their neighbours and a desire that not private buildings, but public should be magnificent. Aristotle, however, would probably find the

in favour of the existence and continuance of a democracy and an oligarchy: cp. 8 (6). 5. 1320 a 2 sqq. and see note on 13 10a 12.
14. áei $\delta \hat{\epsilon}$ к.т.ג., so that not only does the presence in the citizens of the type of character appropriate to a constitution generate that constitution, but a superior quality in the type generates a superior quality of constitution. For the form of the sentence cp. 1. 5.1254 a 25 sq. and 8 (6). 6.1320 b 28 sq. For $\beta$ हeतtıotov see critical note on 1337 a 18 .
 the mouth of one of the characters of his Augê : cp. Diog. Laert.



 Virtutem doceri posse, c. 3. Not only is it necessary in the interest of the constitution that training likely to produce the required $\bar{\eta} \theta$ os should be given in youth, but training in youth is also necessary with a view to the practice of virtue. For previous training is desirable with a view to the practice of all סvváuєs кai $\tau \in \notin \nu a u$, and virtue is a סúvauss (Rhet. 1. 9. 1366a 36 sqq.: contrast Eth. Nic. 2. 4. IIo6 a 6 sqq.). Or the argument may be an a fortiori one. If previous training is necessary for the practice of an art, a fortiori it is necessary for action in accordance with virtue, for the successful practice of an art implies the fulfilment of fewer conditions than action in accordance with virtue (Eth. Nic. 2. 3. 1105 a 26 sqq.). For $\delta$ ovárets kaì $\tau \epsilon \in \chi$ vas see note on 1268 b 36 and Bon. Ind. 207 b 4 sqq., where Metaph. Ө. 2.

 reference is made to Rhet. 1. 2. 1358 a 6 and other passages.

 In $4(7) .13$. 1332 ${ }^{2}$ ro sq., on the other hand, maiocia seems to
 the operations of each of them,' cp. Plato, Symp. 205 B, $\begin{gathered}\text { бैтє кaì ai }\end{gathered}$




ढ̇ாєi $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т... Here Aristotle passes to the second question, whether education should be in the hands of the State or in those
of the private individual (i.e. the father, $\mathrm{cp} .25, \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ avirov̂ $\tau \in \in \kappa \nu \omega \nu)$. Two reasons are given why it should be in the hands of the State: (r) as the whole State (i.e. all the citizens) has one and the same end before it, the education given will be the same for all, hence its management should be in the hands of the State, and not in the hands of parents, as at present, training their children privately and in whatever subjects they please ; (2) the individual should regard himself as part of the State, and the management of the part should be adjusted to the management of the whole [so that it should be in the hands which manage the whole, i.e. the hands of the State]. The first of these two arguments is hardly conclusive. The education given to all might be identical without being placed in the hands of the State. Against the second it may be urged that the welfare of the whole might be kept in view in the training of the part, even if education were not placed in the hands of the State. Compare with Aristotle's view that of Plutarch in Lycurg. et Num. inter se comp. c. 4. We learn from 2. 5. 1263 b $3^{6}$ sq. that Aristotle looks to education to make the State one, and this is another reason why the State should take the charge of it into its own hands.
 him Plato, Laws 804 C-D and 8 ro A. Cp. Eth. Nic. io. 1 o.


 Hist. An. I. Ir. 492 b 15 (Eucken, Beobachtungen über die Praepositionen, p. 45).
 Plato, Laws 942 B sq. T $\hat{\nu} \nu$ коוข $\omega \nu$, education for instance. T $\nu$ ä $\sigma \kappa \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ as well as the things themselves. Aristotle's language recalls the contention of the Lacedaemonians in Diod. II. 55. 4,


27. ä $\mu a$ ઈè к.т. $\lambda_{\text {., ' 'and }}$ at the same time [so far from its being right to think that the individual citizen can justly claim to educate his children as he pleases], it is not even right to think that he belongs to himself ; the true creed is that all the citizens belong to the State.' Aristotle inherits this view from others. Thus we read


 Eiva $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ marpioos, and of the Athenians of the time of the Persian

 thing, indeed, is said by the Corinthian envoys in Thuc. 1. 70.6 of the Athenians at the outset of the Peloponnesian War. But what Aristotle has especially before him is the language of Plato in Laws


 oủaíav. Cp. Cic. De Fin. 2. 14.45, ut ad Archytam scripsit Plato, non sibi se soli natum meminerit, sed patriae, sed suis, ut perexigua pars ipsi relinquatur, and De Offic. 1.25.85. To none of these authorities does it occur for a moment that the Greek citizen belonged to Hellas as well as to his own State. Isocrates may perhaps have remembered this (Jebb, Attic Orators 2. 44). Aristotle does not consider how far the citizen should carry his sense of belonging to his mó入ıs. Clearly he thinks that the citizen should subordinate his private preferences to those of his módcs, but should he suppress conscientious convictions and sink his conscience in the will of the mó入ıs? Suppose the módıs is under a tyranny or extreme oligarchy or extreme democracy? If the virtue of a citizen is relative to the preservation of the constitution (3. 4.1276 b 27 sqq .), a good citizen must apparently do what tends to preserve the constitution, however bad the constitution may be, but what would Aristotle say that a good man ought to do in such a case? Subordinate his conscience to the maintenance of the constitution? If so, contrast the view of the Platonic Socrates in Plato, Gorg. 512 E sq.
 the State belongs to the State: cp. 1. 4. I254 a 9, đó $\tau \epsilon$ yà $\mu$ رóptov









 to in Phaedrus 270 C, and see Stewart on Eth. Nic. i. I3. 7.
31. кai тoûto, 'in this matter also,' i.e. for attending to the education of youth and making it a matter of State-concern: cp. c. $4.133^{8} \mathrm{~b}_{9}$ sqq. The Lacedaemonians were praised for many other things ( 6 (4). I. 1288 b 40 sqq.). It will be noticed that nothing is here said of the Cretans, and that the compliment paid to the Lacedaemonians is not extended to them : cp. Eth. Nic. 10 . 10. 1180 a 24 sqq. and contrast Eth. Nic. 1. 13. 1102 a 10 sqq., where the Cretan lawgiver, no less than the Lacedaemonian, is said to seek to make the citizens good and obedient to the laws.
34. $\pi \omega ิ \mathrm{X}$ Xp̀̀ $\pi \alpha \iota \delta \epsilon u ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a u$, 'how one should have them taught,' C. 2.




 iuvenes oporteat, opp. $\pi \hat{\omega} s$ रpì $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon \in u ́ \epsilon \theta \theta a \imath^{\prime}$ (Bon. Ind. 286 a 33). For $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \stackrel{\ddot{\varepsilon}}{\rho} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \gamma \omega \nu$ in this sense cp. 1337 b 5 sqq. $\Pi^{1}$ Sus. read $\delta i \dot{\alpha} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\tilde{\epsilon} \rho \gamma \omega \nu$, which Sus. ${ }^{2}$ translates 'thatsächlich' (does this mean 'practically'?), but it is difficult to believe that $\delta t a$ is the true reading.



 Teivoo $\hat{\eta}$ tò tò̀s $\phi \rho o ́ v \eta \sigma \tau v$. The study of music, we learn in the sequel, is of value both with a view to virtue and with a view to
 the two ends are not to be confounded. Education in the 'best State' will naturally be adjusted to both, and hence the mention of them here. Aristotle points out that there was no agreement as to the training conducive to either. The Spartans, for instance, would say that gymnastic training was the road both to virtue (c. 3.1337 b 26 sq.) and to the life of empire, which they regarded as the best life ( 4 ( 7 ). 14. 1333 b 20 sqq .), but others would think differently.
38. oưठ'̀ фavepòv k.т.入. As to this see vol. i. p. 354, note 2. For







 of the soul; the phrase is used not only by Plato, but also by Xenophon (Mem. 3. 10.3), and there is nothing technical about it. Sus. ${ }^{3}$ (Ind. s.v. $\psi v x^{\eta}$ ) explains it as synonymous with rò ó $\rho \epsilon \kappa \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v$, but does it not rather mean the diathesis of tò ò $\rho \in \kappa \tau \iota \kappa o ́ \nu$ ?
 starting-point of our inquiry the education with which we are daily in contact, the inquiry proves perplexing.' For ék, cp. De



 Light is thrown on Aristotle's meaning by 1337 b 21 sqq. Actual education had four branches-reading and writing, gymnastic, music, and drawing -and of these reading, writing, and drawing were studied for their utility, and gymnastic as contributing to virtue (c. 3.1337 b 25 sqq.), while the study of music included
 I I sqq.), and was commonly pursued with a view to pleasure ( 1337 b 28). Some authorities favoured studies useful for life, others those contributing to virtue, and others those of an out-of-the-way kind. Aristotle's own aim in planning the education of his 'best State' is to make his citizens men of complete virtue, fit in body, mind, and character to live in the practice of all the virtues and to rule and be ruled with a view to the most desirable life, the life in which work is crowned with leisure. Others had solved the question otherwise. Isocrates is on the whole in favour of useful studies, though he has something to say in defence of Eristic and Geometry and Astronomy, studies belonging to the out-of-the-way class (De Antid. § 261 sqq.: Hel. § 5). Of the Cynic Diogenes we read (Diog. Laert. 6. 73), цоибぃкทิs $\tau є$ каì
 àayкаiшv. For the views of Polybius see Polyb. 9. 20. 6 sqq. On the other hand, Lacedaemonian education was designed to develope virtue, though no doubt a one-sided kind of virtue (c. 4.1338 b

 картєрєì тоуоиิขта каі̀ $\nu \iota к a ̂ \nu ~ \mu а \chi о ́ \mu є \nu о \nu)$. As to the studies falling under the head of $\tau a ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon p ı \tau \tau a ́$, see vol. i. p. 354, note 3 . To the studies there enumerated should be added the wonderful feats of horsemanship which Cleophantus, the son of Themistocles, learnt by his father's wish to perform (Plato, Meno 93 D). Aristotle, however, probably refers especially to the study of Geometry, Astronomy, and Eristic Argument, subjects which had found their way in Isocrates' day into the curriculum at Athens (Isocr. Panath. § 26 : cp. Plato, Protag. 3 I 8 E, where Protagoras is made to sneer at $\lambda о \gamma \iota \sigma \mu$ о́́s $\tau \epsilon$ каì à $\sigma \tau \rho о \nu о \mu i a \nu$ каì $\gamma \epsilon \omega \mu \epsilon \tau \rho i ́ a \nu$ каì $\mu о v \sigma \iota \kappa \eta \eta_{\nu}$ as studies which Hippias of Elis taught and he himself did not, the wisdom
 $\pi \dot{0} \lambda \epsilon \omega s)$. Both $\tau \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau a ́$ and $\tau \grave{a} \chi \rho \eta \dot{\sigma} \tau \mu a$ are here distinguished from тà $\tau \epsilon i v o v \tau a ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ́ \rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$, but many advocates of the study of $\tau \grave{a}$ $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau a \dot{a}$ at any rate would claim that it aided the development of virtue. Cp. Isocr. Busir. § 23, тov̀s $\delta \grave{\epsilon} \nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o u s ~ a ̉ \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta{ }^{\prime} \sigma a \nu \tau a s \tau \omega ิ \nu \dot{\eta} \delta \delta \nu \omega \bar{\nu}$


 $\pi \epsilon \rho ı \tau \tau a \dot{a}$ under Anaxagoras and is thought by Plato and Plutarch to have owed much of his greatness of soul to these studies (Plato, Phaedr. 269 Esq.: Plut. Pericl. cc. $4^{-8}$ ). The virtuous Epaminondas had had a $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \pi \grave{\eta} \pi a \iota \delta \varepsilon i a$ (Plut. De Gen. Socr. c. 3). It is with a view to virtue that Plato recommends the study of Arithmetic, Geometry, and Astronomy (Rep. 525-530: Laws 818-822), and at a later age of Dialectic (Rep. 53 I sqq.: Laws 965). For the contrast between $\tau \grave{\alpha}$ र $\bar{\rho} \eta \boldsymbol{\sigma} \mu \boldsymbol{a} \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \beta i o o \nu ~ a n d ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \pi \epsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau \alpha ́, ~ c p . ~ R h e t . ~$
 ßiov $\epsilon \pi \iota \theta v \mu o v \sigma \iota \nu$, and for the phrase тà $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \iota \mu a$ $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \beta i o v, ~ D i o g . ~$


$$
\begin{aligned}
& \epsilon \text { is тoùs т } \rho a \gamma \varphi \delta \delta o u ̀ s ~ \chi \rho \eta ́ \sigma \iota \mu ', ~ o u ̉ k ~ \epsilon i s ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \beta i ́ o \nu, ~
\end{aligned}
$$

 3. 10. For $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ oú $\delta \dot{\delta} \varphi \nu$ ('nothing is clear'), cp. Plato, Theaet. 20I A, $\mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v \sigma \iota ~ \delta \epsilon ̀ ~ \delta \grave{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ oủ $\delta \in \epsilon ́ \nu$ (' manentibus vero-nec amplius quae-rentibus-nihil erit perspicuum,' Stallbaum).



 quomodo eam vim possit habere dubium videtur ．．．Equidem nomine $\kappa \rho \iota \tau \bar{\prime} s$ ，quoniam coniunctum est cum $\lambda^{2} \mu \beta a \nu \varepsilon \iota \nu$ ，significari putaverim suffragium iudicis：unumquodque ex tribus illis ele－ mentis unius tulit iudicis suffragium＇（Bonitz on Metaph．A． 8. 988 b 22－989 a r9）．See also Bon．Ind．s．v．kpıtís．
1337 b．2．кaì $\gamma \grave{a} \rho \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ à $\rho \in \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ к．т．．．Thus the Spartans identified virtue with military virtue，which is only a part of it（2．9．127x b 2 sqq．）， and naturally erred in their äбкךбוs of virtue（4（7）．15．1334 a 40）． Aristotle＇s remark is perhaps suggested by that of Socrates in


 ка́入入єөта ктй́аито；

3．$\pi$ º́s，cp． 4 （7）．17．1336 b 3 r and 6 （4）．15．1299 a 33.
 à̉râv（i．e．Arithmetic，Geometry，and Astronomy）àvaykaia ．．．$\mu \grave{\eta}$
 reading and writing and a certain amount of arithmetic and geometry as necessary．At Sparta these necessary subjects were evidently insufficiently studied（c．4．I338 b 33）．
 For instance，cookery should not be studied（c．5． 1339 a 39 sqq．）．
 forget that he has begun his sentence with ö̀ ơ ò ò ơ $\pi$ dávra，and he
 Bonitz（Ind． 538 b 38 ）compares De Interp． 14.24 a 6 sqq．，referring to Waitz＇note on this passage．In De Interp．14，however，we have merely a pleonasm of öru，whereas in the passage before us there is a surplusage of an entire clause introduced by ört．Still irregu－ larities in connexion with ör are common in Aristotle＇s writings （see Bon．Ind．s．v．），and I think，on the whole，that Bekker，Bonitz， Sus．，and the rest are right in leaving this awkward sentence as it stands．But a suggestion of Mr．Richards deserves mention，that kai should be added after фavéóv．

6．тต̂v тo九ớт $\omega v$ ，sc．色 $p \gamma \omega \mathrm{v}$ ．Here $\dot{\delta}$ toooùros does not，as it usually does（Bernays，Zwei Abhandlungen über die Aristotel．Theorie des Drama，p．27），refer back to something preceding ；on the contrary it refers forward to ö $\sigma a \tau \omega ิ \nu \quad \chi \rho \eta \sigma i \mu \omega \nu$ к．т．．ג．Compare its use in 12 ，
in c. 6. 1341 a 22 sq., in 3.17 .1288 a 8 , in $8(6)$. 2.1317 b 18 , and in $8(6) .4$. 1319 b 19 sqq.
8. ßávaugov $\delta^{\prime}$ Ëpyov к.т.入. Cp. c. 6. 134 I a 5 sqq. and see vol.i.

 Aristotle probably has before him Plato, Rep. 495 D , ỗ ठ̀̀ є́ $\phi \iota \epsilon ́ \mu \in \nu \circ \iota$



 include the work of the $\theta$ ins or day-labourer (cp. I. II. $125^{8}$ b 25
 described as $\beta$ ávavoros in addition to that of $\dot{o}$ ßávavaos $\tau \in \chi \nu i \tau \eta s$, to which the epithet is more commonly applied. In general, however, the $\theta$ 's and the $\beta$ ávavoos are distinguished (cp. 3. 5. I278 a 12,

 12. 1296 b 29, where we have тò т $\hat{\nu} \nu \beta a v a v ́ \sigma \omega \nu ~ к а i ̀ ~ \mu \iota \sigma \theta a \rho \nu o v ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~$ $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta o s)$. Indeed, notwithstanding what is said in the passage before us, the distinction reappears in this very Book, for in 5 (8). 7. 1342 a 20 we have $\beta$ avav́r $\omega \nu$ кaì $\theta_{\eta \tau \omega} \nu$ (cp. 5 (8). 6. 1341 b 13 ,


 that though the work of oi $\mu \tau \sigma \theta \rho \nu o i v \tau \epsilon s$ deserved to be called ßávavaos on account of its effect on the mind, the work of the ßávavoos $\tau \epsilon \chi$ virns merited the epithet still better, because it injured


 cp. 18, $\pi \rho a ́ \tau \tau \epsilon \iota \tau \iota s$ ท̂ $\mu a \nu \theta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota$, and 4 (7). 17. 1337 а 1, $\pi a ̂ \sigma a ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \chi \nu \eta ~ к a i ̀ ~$ тaıסєia. MáӨךбıs is the wider term, for though in one kind of $\mu \dot{\theta} \theta \eta \sigma \iota s$ the aim is the acquisition of an art (Metaph. Ө. 3. 1046 b $3^{6}$ ), in another it is the acquisition of an extent of knowledge falling short of that possessed by the master of an art (c. 5. I 339 a






 Aristotle refers are probably those of the soldier and citizen
 ${ }^{1} 337$ a 21.
12. tàs tolaútas $\tau$ éxvas. See note on 6 .
 $\tau^{\prime} \chi^{\nu \eta}$ : it is used, for instance, of such occupations as brothelkeeping in Eth. Nic. 4. 3. 112 I b 33. It is not certain what occupations in addition to that of the day-labourer Aristotle intends to include under ai $\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \rho \nu \iota к a i$ є́p $\gamma a \sigma i a \iota$. Does he include the work of a teacher of rhetoric like Isocrates, when done for hire? In Pol. I. II. $125^{8} \mathrm{~b}_{2} 5$ sqq. $\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \rho \nu i a$ is made to comprise both the $\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \rho \nu i a$ of the Bávavaoı тє́ $\chi$ vaı and the $\mu \sigma \sigma \theta a \rho v i a$ of the unskilled
 a sense exclusive of the $\beta$ ávavaot ré $\chi$ vat. The form $\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \rho \nu \iota$ кós occurs also in Eth. Eud. 1. 4. 1215 a 31 and Oecon. 1. 2. 1343 a 29, but Plato uses the form $\mu \iota \sigma \theta a \rho \nu \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ s ~ i n ~ R e p . ~ 346 ~ B, ~ D, ~ a n d ~(i f ~$
 note on 1255 b 26 .
 dence (c. 6. I34I a 28 sqq .), and its absence to make men poorspirited, because it made them like slaves, who have no leisure (4 (7). 15. 1334 a 20). The epithets Aqтוкós and tatєєvós are interchanged in Eth. Nic. 4. 8. 1125 a I sq.
 liberal sciences also, while it is not illiberal to study them up to a certain point, to devote oneself to the study of them in an overaccurate way is bound up with the injurious results already mentioned,' i.e. unfits the body for the pursuits of a soldier and citizen and makes the mind abject. For ${ }^{\prime} \nu o \chi o s$ in this sense see Liddell and Scott. For the view that there is something illiberal in too close a study of a subject compare the passage from the Erastae ascribed to Plato quoted on 1338 b 32 . The study of music has an ill effect when carried too far (c. 6. r 340 b


 32 sqq.). Socrates had said that the study of geometry, astronomy, arithmetic, and medicine should not be carried beyond a certain
point by the ordinary citizen（Xen．Mem．4．7），and Isocrates says the same thing of astronomy and geometry（De Antid．§ 264 ： cp．［Demosth．］Erot．c．44），and Plato of $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a \tau a ~(L a w s ~ 81 o ~ B) . ~$ There were those who said this of philosophy（Plato，Gorg． ${ }_{48} 8$ C），but Aristotle would hardly agree．The Cynics probably inherited the feeling of Socrates on this subject：see as to the Cynic Onesicritus vol．i．p．112，note 1．Plato，on the other hand，had recommended in the case of a few the advanced study of arithmetic，geometry，and astronomy（Laws $818 \mathrm{~A}: \mathrm{cp}$ ． ${ }_{967} \mathrm{D}$ ）；it is not clear whether Aristotle would object to this．
 artes＇had a long subsequent history（see Mr．H．Parker in Eng． Hist．Rev．vol．v．p． 417 sqq．）．The Index Aristotelicus gives no other instance of its occurrence in Aristotle＇s writings．
 1333 a 6 sqq．Aristotle is preparing the way for his recommendation that boys shall be taught to sing and play：many regarded playing as $\chi$ є $\rho$ ovpria（c．6．1340 b 20）and as fraught with 及avavoia （ 340 b 40 sqq．：cp．Plato，Symp． 203 A）．But the singing and playing which Aristotle enjoins will be avirôv $\chi$ व́pı and $\delta \delta^{\prime}$ à $\rho \in \tau \eta \eta^{\nu}$ （c． 6.134 I b 8 sqq．and 1340 b 42）．
 As to aúrov̂ $\chi$ ápel see note on 1277 b 5 ，and cp ．Rhet．3． 18.1419 b


 a ship（Hom．Odyss．5． 243 sqq．），it is for himself．As to $\phi i \lambda \omega \nu$ ，



 Symp． 184 B－C：cp．also Eth．Nic．4．8． 1124 b 3 1，каì（ $\mu є \gamma a \lambda о-$
 See also the story told by Plutarch of Favonius and Pompey
 Io sqq．（which also illustrates $\delta i{ }^{2} a ̈ \lambda \lambda o v s, 20$ ），and Plato，Symp． 185 A sq．

20．As to aủtò roûto and as to the displacement of mo入入ákıs， which belongs to $\delta \delta \xi_{\xi} \epsilon \epsilon \nu \stackrel{a}{ } \nu$ ，see critical note，and cp．Plato，Rep．

 conjunction of $\theta_{\eta}$ ィккóv and $\delta$ ou入ıкóv，cp．Eth．Nic．4．8．I I25 a I sq．
 now commonly known and in use＇（literally＇made public pro－ perty＇），＇as has been said before＇（in c．2．1337 a 39），＇point in two directions，＇i．e．they may be used in support of the view that useful subjects should be studied，or in support of the view that sub－ jects tending to promote virtue should be studied（see note on 1337 a 39）．For ai катаßє $\beta \lambda \eta \mu \epsilon \in \nu a \iota \nu u ̂ \nu \mu a \theta^{\prime} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$, cp．c． $3.133^{8}$ a $3^{6}$ and Plato，Soph． $23^{2} \mathrm{D}$ ，$\tau a ́ \gamma \epsilon \mu \eta ̀ \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \pi a \sigma \omega ิ \nu \tau \epsilon \kappa a i ̀ ~ к а \tau a ̀ ~ \mu i a \nu ~ є ́ \kappa a ́ \sigma \tau \eta \nu ~$

 sunt，＇Stallbaum，who adds＇verbum катаßá入入єє proprie dicitur de iis quae deponuntur in tabulario publico，veluti leges，testimonia， alia monumenta litteris consignata＇）．For є́ $\pi a \mu \phi о т \epsilon \rho i \zeta \rho \sigma \sigma \iota v$, see note on $133^{2}$ a 42.
 omitted，＇as Eaton remarks，who refers to Plato，Protag． 325 D－ $3^{26} \mathrm{C}$（where children are described as going successively to teachers of $\gamma \rho \dot{\mu} \mu \mu a \tau a$ ，teachers of harp－playing，and $\pi a \iota \delta o r \rho i \beta a \iota$ ），and Theag． 122 E．We see from Protag． $3^{25}$ E sqq．that in learning үрá $\mu$ ата children learnt passages of epic poetry by heart，and that in learning harp－playing they learnt to sing to the harp passages of lyrical poetry，so that the study of poetry entered into the study both of $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a \tau a$ and of harp－playing．That the study of $\gamma \rho a \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a$ included learning to write，we see from Laws 8 ro B．It is remark－ able that arithmetic is not mentioned：Sus．${ }^{4}$ takes the elements of arithmetic to be included under $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a \tau a$ ，but does not give any passage in support of this view．According to Blümner（Home Life of the Ancient Greeks，Eng．Trans．，p．III），arithmetical instruction at Athens was given at home，not at school；this may possibly be the reason why nothing is said about it．

24．кaì тétaptov êvıoı ypaфıкทív．Plato had learnt drawing （Diog．Laert．3．5）long before Pamphilus of Amphipolis（the teacher of Apelles，who was a contemporary of Philip and Alexan－ der）had made the study fashionable first at Sicyon and then throughout Greece（Plin．Nat．Hist．35． 76 sq．：see Overbeck， Ant．Schriftquellen，p．330，and Brunn，Gesch．der griech．Künstler 2．I 34 sqq．）．Грaфıкウ́ probably includes painting as well as drawing．Aristotle says nothing of sculpture．
25. Tì $\nu \mu \grave{\epsilon} \nu \quad \gamma \rho \alpha \mu \mu a \tau<\kappa \grave{\eta} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Charondas had insisted on the



 $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ émavop $\theta_{o v ̂ v \tau a, ~ a n d ~ E u r i p . ~ F r a g m . ~ 582, ~ w h i c h ~ i s ~ s o ~ s i m i l a r ~}^{\text {a }}$ in effect to the passage of Diodorus that one is inclined to ask whether Euripides had the words of Charondas before him. Cp . also $133^{8}$ a 15 sqq.
 (c. 4. 1338 b Ix sqq.), and also Aristippus (Diog. Laert. 2. 91).
 with which it is taught. Here daamopeiv takes an acc. of the thing which causes perplexity, as àmopeiv does in Meteor. 1. 1. 339 a 2,
 gives a wider meaning to $\mu \circ v \sigma \iota \kappa \boldsymbol{\eta}$ than Aristotle does, we have seen in vol. i. p. 405. Both agree that $\mu$ ovøıк $\eta$ is concerned with $\mu \epsilon \lambda_{0}$ тонia (c. 7. I34I b 23 sqq. : Gorg. 449 D), but while to Plato (Rep. 398 D) a $\mu$ édos consists of $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ a ́ p \mu o \nu i a ~ a n d ~ p o v \theta \mu o ́ s, ~ A r i s t o t l e ~ d i s-~$ tinguishes $\mu \in \lambda$ отotia and $\lambda \epsilon$ écis (Poet. 6. 1449 b 33 sqq., 1450 a 13 sqq.).
 $\chi$ व́pıv ä้ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ (sc. oüбas). For the fact cp. Plato, Laws 655 C , каiтoı


 $\chi \rho \eta$ бєцоя к.т. $\lambda$.
29. $\mu \epsilon \tau \in ́ x$ ºưเv aủtท̂s, 'learn it,' cp. c. 2. 1337 b 6 sqq., and see note on 1339 a 14 .





 6. II57b i6. Aristotle has not said before that Nature aims at this, but he has implied it in 2.9. 1271 a 41 sqq. and 4 (7). 14 . 1334 a 2 sqq., passages in which he points out the disastrous consequences to the Lacedaemonian State of a forgetfulness of this.
 1281 a 26.
 agendarum principium est.' With Sus. I take Aristotle to refer
 and others). For the attraction of the pronoun into the gender of the predicate, cp. (with Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ) 4 (7). $7 \cdot 1327$ b 4 I. For the phrase,

 àvíyk $\eta$.
$\pi \alpha ́ \lambda \iota v$, for the lesson has already been taught in 4 (7). 14. 1334 a 2 sqq.
33. $\epsilon \mathfrak{i} \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ăp $\mu \omega \mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ ठєî к.т. $\lambda$. Гáp introduces a justification of
 thought cp. $4(7) \cdot 15.1334$ a 16 sqq. The answer which is gradually given to the question in what activities leisure should be spent is, as we shall see, 'in activities desirable for their own sake.'
34. кaì ténos, 'and is its end': cp. 4. (7). 15. 1334 a 14 sqq. Mr. Welldon has anticipated me in retaining $\tau \epsilon \bar{\lambda}$ os and placing a comma after it.
35. oủ $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ס̀̀ maíhovtas, 'for surely not in playing.' Cp. Eth. Nic. 10. 6. 1176 b 27 sqq. Aristotle probably has before him


$\tau \epsilon$ 有 $\gamma$ à $\rho$ к.т. $\lambda .$, 'for then, [as leisure is the end of life,] play would necessarily be to us the end of life.' Sus. would read in

 $\stackrel{\leftrightarrow}{a} \nu$ є $\neq \eta$ may be supplied with ảvaykaîov: cp. Xen. Oecon. 3. 13 and 4. I5. It seems to me more natural to supply àv $\epsilon \nexists \eta$ than $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau t$. Many made play the end of life : cp. c. 5.1339 b $3^{1}$ sqq., and Ephor. Fragm. 82 (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 1. 259), ${ }^{2}$ E $\phi_{0 \rho o s ~}^{\text {év }} \boldsymbol{\pi \epsilon} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \mu \pi \tau \varphi$

 forum of Thannyas or Timegad in Algeria runs 'venari lavari ludere ridere-oc est vivere' (Prof. Sayce, Algerian Notes, Acadimy', No. 780, April 16, 1887, p. 279).




 à $\sigma \chi o \lambda i a t s$, as a relief after toil (cp. 37).

ஸ́s тробáүovтаs фариакєias Xápıw. A drug differs from an article of daily food, in that it is only for occasional use : cp. Oecon. I. 5 .

 $\nu 0 \sigma \hat{\eta}, a \dot{a} \pi \lambda \omega \bar{s} \delta^{\prime}$ oű. For the medical use of the word $\pi \rho o \sigma a ́ \gamma \epsilon \iota \nu \mathrm{cp}$.




42. ăvยєเs $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda .$, ' for the movement of the soul to which we have referred' (that involved in play) 'is [remedial in character, for it is] a relaxation of strain and a remission because of the pleasure which accompanies it, [and only in place at times when there is strain].'


 thought to have in itself pleasure and happiness and blissful life, [so that it does not need to be helped out with play, and we should not spend leisure in play].'
3. тои̂то $\delta^{\prime}$ ои̉ к.т. $\lambda .$, ' and this' (i.e. happiness) 'does not belong to those who work, but [only] to those who are at leisure, for he who works works for the sake of some end as having it not, but happiness is an end, inasmuch as all think that it is conjoined not with pain but with pleasure, [and therefore, as he has not the end, he has not happiness].' That things conjoined with pleasure were commonly regarded as ends, we see from Rhet. r. 7. $1364 \mathrm{~b} 23^{-25}$. Aristotle's object in adding this remark is to point out that not only does leisure bring happiness with it, but that work does not; he thus prepares the way for the distinction which he proceeds to draw in II sqq. between studies which are preparatory for work and studies which are preparatory for leisure, the former being, like work, a means to an end, and the latter, like leisure, desirable for their own sake and an end in themselves. Sus. reads тоиิто $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ in place of тоиิто $\delta \epsilon$, but in this Mr. Welldon does not follow him, and rightly, for tovito $\delta^{\prime}$ ou к. к..$\lambda$. does not contain the proof that leisure is thought to have in it pleasure and happiness, but an added




 ceases, for] all do not find the pleasure which accompanies happiness in the same pleasure.' Cp. Plato, Laws 658 E (quoted below


 éavtóv and aúrov̂, cp. Plato, Gorg. 503 E , $̈ \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ кaì oi ä̀ $\lambda$ до $\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s$


9. $\omega \sigma \tau \epsilon$ фаvєрòv к.т. $\lambda$., 'and so, [as leisure is the end], it is
 leisure spent in noble enjoyment also,' as well as with a view to work. For $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \hat{\eta} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$, cp. c. 7 . 1342 a 3 I, $\tau \hat{\eta} S$ 白 $\nu$ $\phi \iota \lambda o \sigma o \phi i a$ $\delta \iota a r \rho \iota \beta \hat{\eta} s$. It is obviously strange that we should have
 it is possible that $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \epsilon \in \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \hat{\eta} \sigma \chi \chi^{\circ} \lambda \eta^{\prime} \nu$ is a simple blunder, and that we should read $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \hat{\eta} \delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$ (with Cor.) in place of it. But Sus., following Prof. Postgate (Notes, p. 15), leaves the text as it stands, and I incline on the whole to do so too, though Bonitz adds a query to the words (Ind. 74I a 40) and Jackson would omit $\sigma \chi^{\circ} \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$ as an interpolation and understand $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \eta \nu$ (Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ad loc.). For looking to 1337 b 3r, $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \delta u ́ v a \sigma \theta a \iota ~ к a \lambda \omega ิ s, ~$ and 1338 a 1, тò $\sigma \chi^{0} \lambda a ́ \zeta \epsilon \iota \nu$ (cp. 4 (7). 14. 1334 a 9), we expect that the conclusion drawn in 1338 a 9 sqq. will be that it is well to study with a view to taking leisure, or taking leisure nobly, and $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \hat{\eta} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$, 'leisure spent nobly in diagogê,' comes nearer to this than $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\epsilon} \nu \tau \hat{\eta} \sigma \chi o \lambda \hat{\eta} \delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \dot{\eta} \nu$. Not leisure spent anyhow, but leisure spent in diagogê is the end with a view to which Aristotle claims that study should be especially pursued. The words tàs $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \pi \rho o ̀ s \tau \eta$ à $\chi_{\chi} \boldsymbol{\lambda} i a \nu(12)$ also, as Postgate points out, require $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta \nu} \sigma \chi 0 \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu$, and
 $\epsilon \sigma \theta a t$, cp. Theophil. KıAap@óós Fragm. (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 628), $\mu$ é $\gamma a s$

Mav $a \dot{v e t v}$ is to learn, $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon u \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ to be trained by another.
11. For the repetition of the pronoun in taûta . . . $\tau \alpha u ́ t a s ~ s e e ~$ note on I3I7 b 5 .
 for work are pursued as necessary and as being for the sake of other things.'
13. Stó, 'hence,' i.e. because it is right that studies which contribute to the enjoyment of leisure should find a place in education.
15. $\omega \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho \frac{\tau}{\alpha} \gamma р \alpha ́ \mu \mu \alpha \tau \alpha$ к.т. $\lambda$. See note on 1337 b 25 .
16. каi $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu \alpha ́ \theta \eta \sigma \iota v$, 'and for the acquisition of knowledge': cp. 39 sq. and Isocr. Panath. § 209, $\omega \sigma \tau^{\prime}$ ov̉ঠ̀ $\gamma \rho a ́ \mu \mu a \tau a ~ \mu a \nu \theta a ́ \nu o v \sigma \iota \nu$,

 каì т $\hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\pi} \dot{\omega} \pi о \tau \epsilon \gamma \epsilon \nu \circ \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$.
17. Soкєî $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. Learning to draw was evidently held by many to make men skilful in the purchase of works of art, furniture, and equipments of all kinds (I338 a 40 sqq.).
19. $\pi \rho$ òs úyítav каì à $\lambda \kappa \eta \dot{\eta}$, 'for health and prowess in battle.' Not every one would agree with Aristotle that learning music does not produce military prowess in the learner: cp. Plut. Lycurg.

 $\tau \rho \circ \pi \dot{\eta}{ }_{\eta} \nu$ к.т. . : $^{\text {: Plut. De Musica c. 26. And if the study of music }}$ does not produce health, listening to music was thought by Theophrastus to cure some diseases (Athen. Deipn. 624 a); indeed, a plague was thought to have been stayed at one time at Sparta by the Cretan musician Thaletas (Plut. De Mus. c. $4^{2}$ ).
 useful for rational enjoyment in leisure.' Aristotle has shown that the study of music is not useful for purposes connected with work, like learning to read and write and to draw, nor productive of bodily advantages useful for work, like gymnastic ; hence he concludes that it is useful for leisure. He omits to inquire at present whether it is not productive of moral and intellectual virtues useful for work; we shall find later on that it is (c.5.1340 a 18 sqq.). This somewhat invalidates the conclusion which he arrives at here.
22. єis öтєр к.т.ג., 'into which they do in fact evidently introduce it.' Kaì фaivovta, i. e. not only may be inferred to introduce it, but manifestly do so: cp. кaì $\sigma v \mu \beta a i \nu \epsilon \iota$ in 2. 3. 1262 a 18 sq.

 Vahlen on Poet. 3. 1448 a 24 ('Aristotelem nemo nescit usum neutrius valde adamasse') and 4 . 1449 a 7 . Aristotle takes no notice of the use of music in the worship of the gods.
$\hat{\eta} \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т...., 'for they give it a place in that which they think is the form of rational enjoyment appropriate to the free' (i.e. feasting), and therefore appropriate to those who are at leisure, for leisure belongs to freemen : cp. 4 (7). 15. 1334 a 20, oủ $\sigma \chi 0 \lambda \grave{\eta}$ סoúdots. Aristotle would hardly agree with their view that banquet-
 1339 a 16 Sqq. he treats conviviality $\left(\mu_{\epsilon}^{\prime} \theta \eta\right)$ as a means of relaxation, not as $\delta \iota a y \omega \gamma \dot{\eta}$.
 17. $3^{82}$,
but the line first quoted by him, à $\lambda^{\prime}$ oiov к...$\lambda$., finds no place in our text, any more than it does, as Sus. ${ }^{4}$ points out, in Plato, Rep.
 Note 997). Probably we should read $\mu$ óvov in place of $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \nu$ in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ oiov k.т..ג. I take Aristotle's text to have been-

It is just possible that oi in 26 is a false reading for $\kappa a i$, but there is no absolute necessity for any change. Spengel, followed by Sus.,
 these words as not forming part of the quotation, but the form of the word кa入є́ovat seems to show that it is quoted from Homer. As to the differences between our text of Homer and Aristotle's quotations, see note on 1285 a 12. For the use of music at banquets, cp. Hom. Odyss. 1. $\mathbf{I}^{2}$. Aristoxenus gave a fanciful reason for it, quite different to that given here (Plut. De Musica, c. 43 : Aristox. Fragm. 91 in Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 2. 291 : cp. Plato, Tim. 47 D).
27. каî єُv ä̉入入oıs $\delta \in \in$ к.т. $\lambda$. Hom. Odyss. 9. 5 sqq. For ( $\delta$ ) 'Oסvøбєús see critical note.
32. то́тєрои $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. This promise is not fulfilled in the Politics as we have it : see vol. ii. p. xxviii sq.
33. kai $\pi \hat{\omega}$ s, 'and how they are to be studied ': cp. c. 2. 1337 a 34 sq.
34. For the needless addition of $\pi \epsilon \rho i$ aủtêv, cp. $\pi \epsilon \rho i ̀$ av̀ $\bar{\eta} s$, c. 5 . 1339 a 15 .
 have been taken of the construction of this sentence. Some have

 $\pi T \omega \chi o ́ v$, and Acts 21. I and 22. 17 (referred to by Hermann ad Viger. p. 23 I note, cp. p. 749); the translation will then be, 'but now it has happened that thus much profit has accrued to us.' Others have taken rooov̀тov civaı together in the sense of 'to this extent at least,' civai being used as in such phrases as katà rov̂тo civac (Plato, Protag. ${ }^{17} 7$ A, where Stallbaum renders 'quantum quidem ad hoc attinet': see his note and Ast, Lex. Platon. 1. 625). Göttling, who refers to Lobeck, Phryn. p. 275, Stahr in his edition of the Politics, and Sus. ${ }^{4}$ appear to understand the passage thus. The translation will then be, 'but now to this extent at least we have profited.' I should prefer the second of these two interpretations if eiva followed $\tau 0 \sigma o \hat{\tau} \tau o \nu$ immediately without the interposition of $\dot{\eta} \mu i \nu$. In support of the first interpretation it may be noted that

 Xen. Cyrop. 5. 2. 12. There is a further difference as to the meaning of $\pi \rho o ̀ ~ o ́ \delta o \hat{v}$, Sus. ${ }^{2}$ translating the sentence 'für jetzt steht uns vorläufig nur so viel fest,' and Welldon, 'at present however we have advanced so far as to see that,' etc., where 'vorläufig' and 'advanced' seem to represent $\pi \rho \dot{o}$ ó $\delta o \hat{v}$. My own rendering has been suggested by the meaning assigned to the word by Liddell and Scott.
 (cp. 1337 b 29, oi ' ' $\xi$ à $\rho \chi \hat{\eta} s$ ) ' we have a testimony derived from the established studies [that there are subjects which should be taught the young not as necessary but as liberal and noble].' The ancients are regarded by Aristotle as the authors of the established curriculum.

37．тoûto，＇this fact，＇i．e．that we have the testimony of the ancients to this effect．



 $\mu a \theta \eta \sigma \tau v$ ovvteivov：compare the contrast in Plato，Rep． $5{ }^{27} \mathrm{~A}$





 лрáधє к．т．入．For the contemptuous reference to $\sigma \kappa \kappa \dot{\eta} \eta$ ，cp．Plato，Rep．




1338 b ．1．We expect $\bar{a} \lambda \lambda \alpha ́$ or $\bar{a} \lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha} \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ in place of $\grave{\eta} \mu \hat{\alpha} \lambda \lambda o v$ ，but $\hat{\eta} \mu \hat{\lambda} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ is substituted as less dogmatic，and partly also perhaps because ä入入á has been used in the preceding line．＂H＇modeste affir－ mantis est＇（Bon．Ind．312 b 57 sqq．：cp．Trendelenburg on De An． 1．1． 403 b．8）．In 3．1． $1275^{\text {a } 25}$ and 7 （5）．6．1305 b $28 \eta$ takes the place of $\delta \epsilon$ ．
 тоєєî $\mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda о \nu$ ．We expect $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho \eta \tau ו \kappa o u ́ s ~ r a t h e r ~ t h a n ~ \theta \epsilon \omega р \eta \tau ו \kappa o ́ v, ~ b u t ~ c o m-~$ pare the change from the singular to the plural in c． 6.134 r b
 （Welldon）．



 probably would not go so far as Diotima in Plato，Symp． 210 sq ．， as to the results of studying rò é $\pi \grave{\imath} \pi \hat{a} \sigma \iota$ roîs $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \sigma \iota$ кád $\lambda o s$ ，but he apparently holds that the study of drawing helps to make men capable of diagogê．We note that he says nothing of landscape beauty，or of the use of drawing in cultivating a perception of it． In tà $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a$ he no doubt refers mainly to the bodies of animals，
and especially of human beings（cp．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \sigma \omega \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ in c．4．1338 b II）． As to Aristotle＇s value for beauty，cp．Lucian，De Saltat．c．7o，

 rágaӨoû кaì roùro cilval；（I do not notice that this dictum is included in Rose＇s collection of the Fragments of Aristotle，ed．2，1886．） For the phrase $\tau o \hat{v} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \sigma \omega ́ \mu a \tau a ~ к a ́ \lambda \lambda o v s, ~ c p . ~ 4 ~(7) . ~ 5 . ~ I 326 ~ b ~ 34, ~, ~$
 note in Sus．${ }^{4}$


 passages show that there is no occasion to change é $\lambda \in v \theta \epsilon \in \rho o u s ~ i n t o ~$
 cp．（with Eaton and Congreve）Eth．Nic．4．8．II25 a II sq．

4．ėmei Sè фavєpòv к．т．入．Cp． 4 （7）．15．I334b 8－28．
 and $\pi a \iota \delta o r \rho \iota \beta \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ at seven，Aristotle follows with some variation in
 éкaтépous（after the completion of the sixth year），roùs $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ ä $\rho \rho \in \nu a s$＇$\phi$＇
 Republic，on the other hand，$\mu$ ovaıк $\eta$ seems to precede $\gamma v \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta$
 on Protag． 326 B）．At Athens boys began their studies by learning to read and write（aet． $7-\mathrm{II}$ ）；at about eleven they were sent to a harp－player to learn the harp；how early their gymnastic studies began is uncertain（Blümner，Home Life of the Ancient Greeks， Eng．Trans．pp．III－II5）．Aristotle postpones learning to read and write and learning to sing and play till puberty（c．4．1339 a 4 sq．）and puts the boys in charge of gymnastic trainers and $\pi a \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta a \iota$ from seven till puberty．Till puberty they are to receive no literary training．His scheme of training resembles the Lace－ daemonian more than the Athenian，but it avoids imposing on boys the severe physical toil imposed on them at Sparta，and it gives up three years after puberty to the exclusive study of subjects other than gymnastic．We may be quite sure that no young Spartan was permitted to drop gymnastic for three years．

7．тоúтш上 үà $\rho$ к．т．入．Cp． 6 （4）．1． 1288 b 16 sqq．，where it is implied that $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ imparts a certain bodily $\tilde{\epsilon} \xi \iota s$ and that $\pi a \iota \delta o-$ $\tau \rho \iota \beta \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ imparts $\epsilon \in \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu$ ả $\gamma \omega \nu i a \nu$ ．Cp．also Eth．Nic． 5.



 $\kappa[a i]$ кататє́ $\lambda \tau \eta \nu$ àфıє́vaı סıóáбкоvбıv, and Plato, Gorg. 456 E , тoùs
 the $\pi a \iota \delta o t p i \beta \eta s$ would teach boys of seven only easy accomplishments, such as shooting with the bow and throwing the dart. In Plato, Gorg. 45 I E sq. and 452 B , however (cp. 504 A ), the business of the $\pi a \iota \delta o \tau \rho i \beta \eta s$ is said to be to produce physical beauty and strength.
C.4. 9. Nûv $\mu$ èv oûv к.т. $\lambda$. Mèv oủv has apparently nothing to answer to it in the sequel ; the answering clause would have run, if it had not been suppressed, 'but we must take quite a different course.' Little is said by Aristotle in confutation of the first of the two errors here referred to, probably because it was generally felt to be an error, but the second is dealt with at some length, because the Lacedaemonian training still stood high in common opinion. Phocion, for instance, sent his son to Sparta to undergo the training (Plut. Phoc. c. 20). The late Mr. Mark Pattison notes in his copy of Stahr's edition of the Politics on 1338 b $9-19$, 'Respicit hic locus ad Plat. Rep. libr. iii. et speciatim ad pag. 4 Io D.'
 to (vol. i. p. 357 , note 2 : cp. also Plut. Sympos. 2. 5. 2, $\dot{\omega} \theta \iota \sigma \mu \mathrm{i} s$

 also probably the Argives: cp. Aristophon, 'Iarpós (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 3. 357),

## 


and see Meineke's note. The Cynic Diogenes agreed with Aristotle in objecting to this kind of training (Diog. Laert. 6. Зо, ë $\pi \epsilon \iota \tau a \epsilon \in \nu \tau \hat{\eta}$

 Or. I. 10 D sq. It is to the habit of body characteristic of athletes that Aristotle objects, not to the practice of athletic exercises; the Spartan training included the latter, for instance boxing (cp.
 4 (7). 17. 1336 a 6 we have $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \kappa \grave{\eta} \nu \tilde{\epsilon} \xi \iota \nu$ 。 'A $\theta \lambda \eta \tau \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu$, being placed before $\tilde{\epsilon} \xi\llcorner\nu$, is emphatic.






 fià кaì rò бкафєíov（Arat．c．3）．The excessive labour exacted from athletes would also tell on their physical growth，no less than the excessive amount of food they took：cp．Isocr．Ad Demon．§ 12 ，
 av゙ $\xi \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ \pi \epsilon ́ \phi \cup к є$ ．

 Pericles says of the Spartans（Thuc．2．39．2），кaì èv taîs maíciaus oi
 of the Cretans（Fragm． 64 Müller，ap．Strab．p．480），$\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta \grave{\varepsilon} \tau$ ò $\mu \dot{\eta}$
 Eurip．Suppl． 858 Bothe（ 884 Dindorf），
 ${ }_{\epsilon}{ }^{\prime} \chi a \imath \rho \epsilon \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ̉ \nu \delta \rho \epsilon i ̀ \nu . ~$
Hippocrates shared the view that hard physical labour produces courage（De Aere，Aquis，Locis，vol．i．p． 565 Kühn），кai àmò $\mu$ èv



 as the reverse of $\theta \eta p \iota \omega \delta \epsilon \iota s$ ，for he says of Dercyllidas（Fragm． 130

 $\pi \rho о \sigma \eta \gamma$ о́ $є \in о \nu$.

14．каito九 к．т．$\lambda$ ．Here we have ov̈rє taken up by oütє and in 16 by $\tau \in$（＇nay more＇）：see Kühner，Ausführl．gr．Gramm．，ed．2， §536． 3 a，and note on 1272 b 19.

то入入ákเs，in 2．9．127I a $4 \mathrm{I}-\mathrm{b} 6: 4$（7）．14． 1333 b 5 sqq．，and 4 （7）．15． 1334 a 40 sqq．
 of $\mu \dot{\alpha} \lambda \iota \sigma \tau \alpha$ is probably due to the position of $\mu \dot{i} a{ }^{\prime}$（Richards）． The sentence，if completed，would run，ov̈тє $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \mu i a \nu ~ \tau a v ́ \tau \eta \nu ~ o u ̈ \tau \epsilon ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~$ رú入ıo兀a тaúтŋข．See Kühner，Ausführl．gr．Gramm．，ed．2，§452．I a．
16. тоûто, i. е. тò $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a u ́ t \eta \nu . ~$
17. ойтє $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. It has not been noticed, so far as $I$ am aware, that Aristotle here tacitly corrects a saying ascribed to


 to this view of Anacharsis in Suppl. 760,

єîval $\beta$ úß̉дov $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ карлòs oủ кратєî $\sigma \tau a ́ \chi u \nu$ ?
Plato had already said in Rep. $43 \circ \mathrm{~B}$, סокєis $\gamma a ́ p ~ \mu o \iota ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu$ ỏp $\theta \dot{\eta} \nu \delta o ́ \xi a \nu$

 and formidable men, however, were commonly likened to wild animals (Deinon ap. Athen. Deipn. 633 d sq.: Plut. Aristid. c. 18).
 by Homer $\theta v \mu \dot{\mu} \lambda^{\prime} \omega \nu$ in Il. 5.639 and Odyss. 11. 267 (cp. Hymn. Homer. I5, єis 'Hраклє́a $\lambda_{\epsilon о \nu \tau o ́ \theta v \mu o \nu, ~ a n d ~ s e e ~ L i d d e l l ~ a n d ~ S c o t t, ~}^{\text {en }}$ S.v. $\theta v \mu o \lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu)$. Among the lower animals the dog is probably referred to: cp. Plato, Soph. ${ }_{2} 3^{1}$ A, кaì $\gamma$ à $\rho$ кuvì 入úкоs, à aptótatov $\dot{\eta} \mu \epsilon \rho \omega \tau а ́ \tau \varphi$. For the gentleness ascribed to the lion cp. Hist. An. 9.
 $\pi \epsilon \iota \nu \hat{\nu} \nu$ ס̀̀ каі̆ $\beta \epsilon \beta \rho \omega \kappa \grave{s} \pi \rho a o ́ \tau a \tau o s: A n a l$. Pr. 2. 27. 70 b 26, ó $\lambda \epsilon ́ \omega \nu$
 кuì àvסрєía кaì єủyєvŋ̂, oìov $\lambda \epsilon \epsilon \omega \nu$. Plato also has a favourable opinion of the lion (Rep. 589 B). Yet Homer says of Achilles (Il. 24.4I),

The authorities followed by Pliny ascribed clemency to the lion (Nat. Hist. 8. 48, leoni tantum ex feris clementia in supplices: prostratis parcit et, ubi saevit, in viros potius quam in feminas fremit, in infantes non nisi magna fame).
 being the offspring of savageness, there are many very savage races which are wholly devoid of courage. The Achaei and Heniochi dwelt on the East coast of the Euxine. The Heniochi were believed to be an offshoot of the Lacedaemonians (Strabo,

 there is therefore some appropriateness in the reference to them here in an argument directed against Lacedaemonian customs. The wild races on the Euxine are described as $\theta \eta \rho \iota \omega$ óters in Eth.

Nic．7．6． 1148 b 21 sqq．also．Cannibalism is a sign of àyptỡグ



22．$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \bar{\eta} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \omega \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$＇$\theta v \omega \hat{\nu}$ ，＇continental nations，＇as distinguished

 probably especially referred to ：cp．Isocr．Paneg．§ 187 ，$\epsilon i$ tò̀ $\mu \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \nu$

 § I19，where we read of Jason of Pherae，ėmociito yà $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ roùs $\lambda$ dóyous $\dot{\omega} s$
 were perhaps regarded as wilder than island races；they were less in the way of intercourse with others．

23．$\lambda$ Пбтрıќ́．Aristotle will not allow that these nations are тодє $\mu \kappa \kappa \dot{a}$ ：he slips in the word $\lambda_{\eta \sigma \tau \rho \iota к a ́ ~ i n s t e a d: ~ c p . ~ D e m o s t h . ~ P h i l . ~}^{\text {．}}$
 $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \pi \rho \dot{\omega} \tau \eta \nu$ ，and Strabo，p．833，where we read of Masinissa，àvгì tov̂


 a singular and a plural verb after a neut．plur．nominative see Bon．Ind． 490 a 56 sqq．
 need not go so far afield as to the races of the Euxine to prove that the Lacedaemonian system of gymnastic training is not the true means of producing courage，for the experience of the Lacedaemonian State has proved this．

25．＇ॄ゙ $\omega \mathrm{s} \mu$ èv aủroì к．т．入．Aùroí，＇alone＇：see notes on $125^{2}$ a 14 and 1278 b 24，and cp．De Gen．An．2．8． 748 b 5．That the Spartans were thought to be $\phi \iota \lambda$ ótovol，we see from Isocr．Archid．



26．vûv $\delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к．т．．．．Aristotle no doubt has before him in his refer－ ence to athletic contests the story told of Epaminondas by Plutarch，




 Thebans in battle，cp．Diod． 15.87 ．I．For the absence of $\begin{gathered}\text { iv }\end{gathered}$


27. oủ $\gamma \grave{a} \rho$ к.т.入. Lord Macaulay says the same thing in his note, History of England, c. 23 (Cabinet Edition, vol. viii. p. 13), though he does not refer to the Politics. That at Athens there was no public training for war, we see from Xen. Mem. 3. 12. 5.
 according to Bonitz (Ind. 539 a 42), who remarks, 'interdum negatio universo enunciato vel enunciati membro praeponitur, cum pertineat ad unum quoddam eius vocabulum,' and gives many other instances.
28. For tòv тро́tov toûtov see note on 1281 a 21.
30. oúठè $\gamma$ à $\lambda$ रúkos к.т. $\lambda$. See vol. i. p. 357 , note 3 , and cp . Eth.

 Opareís. It would seem from Plato, Laches 196 E sq. that everybody regarded wild animals as courageous (cp. Laws 963 E). Gryllus is made to argue to this effect in Plut. Gryllus, c. 4. 988 C sq.
oủdè $\tau \omega \hat{\nu}$ ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ Өnpi $\omega \nu$. For the gen. see note on 1259 b 24 .
31. ả $\lambda \lambda \alpha \grave{\alpha} \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o \nu$ ảvท̀p ảya日ós. Cp. Plato, Laws 64 I B, $\gamma^{\epsilon \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o u ~}$
 $\nu ו \kappa \hat{\epsilon} \in \nu$ тoùs $\pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu i o u s ~ \mu a \chi o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu o \iota$.
32. of $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ к.т. ., 'but those who throw boys too much into these hard physical exercises and leave them untrained in necessary things make them in truth [not good men, but] sordid, for they make them useful to political science only for one task, and for this, as our inquiry tells us' (cp. 27, $\lambda \epsilon \iota \pi о \mu \epsilon ́ \nu o v s ~ e ́ \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega \nu), ~ ' l e s s ~ w e l l ~$








 Aristotle appears to imply that the Lacedaemonian State did not oblige the young Spartan to learn to read and write (see Blümner, Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, Eng. Trans., p. 100 sq.). Has
he in his mind the language used by Archidamus (Thuc. r. 84)





 apud Platonem creberrimi usus est' (see Stallbaum on Plato, Polit. ${ }_{275}$ E). In Phys. 7. 4. 249 a 21 we have oquaivet ó 入óros
 ठ $\bar{\eta} \lambda о \nu$ к.т....
36. $\delta \in i \quad \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т.X., ' and we ought to judge [whether they train them worse than others do]' etc. This remark may probably have reference to a reply of the Lacedaemonians to the Thebans, when the latter bade them fight or acknowledge their inferiority to the Thebans; the Lacedaemonians answered, $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \mu \grave{\mu} \nu$ той $\pi o ́ \tau \epsilon \rho о г ~ \beta \epsilon \lambda-$
 (Aristid. Or. in Platon. 4. ap. Phot. Biblioth. Cod. 248. 425 a 21 sqq. Bekker).
 (Sepulv. ' concertatores et aemulos disciplinae').
 Aristotle would no doubt exclude at this age the pancration and the pentathlon, which were among the ßapúrepa ầخa (Aeschin. c. Ctes. c. 179: Paus. 6. 24. r), and would probably desire that contests even in running and leaping should be made as little exacting as possible. In the Panathenaea at one time boys contended in the pentathlon, but later on this was dropped (Blümner, Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, Eng. Trans., p. 373). See vol. i. p. 358 , note 1 , and cp. 8 (6). 7. 1321 a 24 sq. In Plut. De Gen. Socr. c. 26 sub fin. it is implied that àvaүкаia â $\theta \lambda a$ are not suitable for a boy of fifteen.

т ̀̀v Biacov трофŋ̆v, 'the constrained diet of athletes': see Liddell and Scott s.v. àvayкoтpoф́é $\omega$, and cp. Hippocr. De Diaet. i. vol. i. p. 664 Kühn, $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a \sigma i \omega \nu \tau \omega ิ \nu$ ảmò ßing $\gamma \iota \nu \rho \mu \hat{\nu} \nu \omega \nu$.
41. Toùs $\pi \rho$ òs $\mathfrak{a} v a ́ \gamma \kappa \eta \nu$ móvous. Cp. Rhet. I. II. I370 a 16 , ơò̀èv

 $\mathrm{P}^{2,3.4}$ Bekk. we read סivvarau, we must supply đà àvaүкaia $\gamma v \mu \nu a ́ a t a ~$ (cp. 4).
 had a list of Olympic victors before him, and possibly not merely the list inscribed on stone at Olympia, but a list in the form of a book. 'With the year B.c. 776 began the list of Olympic victors used by the Alexandrian writers on chronology. A list of this kind was first published by the sophist Hippias of Elis, a contemporary of Socrates (Plut. Numa, c. r : cp. Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 2. 61 and Zeller, Gr. Ph. I. 958. 1). The list was later dealt with by Aristotle and others' (Busolt, Gr. Gesch., ed. 2, 1. 585). See on this subject Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 109. I (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., I. 104. 1) : V. Rose, Aristoteles Pseudepigraphus, p. 545 sqq.: Heitz, Die verlorenen Schriften des Aristoteles, p. 254. Milo of Crotona was one of the exceptions; he won in the wrestling-match for boys at Olympia, and also won in the wrestling-match for men at six Olympic festivals between b.c. $53^{2}$ and 512 (Holm, Gr. Gesch. x. 439). In Herondas r. 50 sqq. Gryllus, the hero of the piece, is said to have achieved almost as much.
3. áфaıpeîofat tク̀̀v $\delta$ óvapur. Cp. Eth. Nic. 2. 2. 1104 a
 ioxúv.
4. ötav $\delta$ ' $\mathfrak{a} \phi^{\prime} \eta{ }^{\eta} \beta \eta$ к. к.т. $\lambda$. See vol. i. p. $35^{88}$, note 2. The 'other studies' are reading and writing, music and drawing. Plato, on the other hand (Laws 809 E sqq.), allots three years (aet. 10-13) to reading and writing, and three more (aet. 13-16) to lessons on the harp. Aristotle evidently thinks it better to postpone these studies till after the attainment of puberty. His view is that mental work is not favourable to the body ( r 339 a 7 fqq .), and he desires that the important physical change involved in the attainment of puberty should have been safely and well achieved before any mental training begins. By $\eta_{\beta} \eta$ Aristotle evidently
 attainment of the age at which youths arrived at $\eta \beta \eta$ in the eye of the law, but the advent of physical puberty, which seems to be placed in the fourteenth year in Hippocr. Coacae Praenotiones, vol. i. p. $3^{21}$ Kühn. Aristotle appears to devote to the more exacting kind of gymnastic training all the years intervening between three years after puberty and twenty-one. He makes no provision for the military duties which occupied the young Athenian during his nineteenth and twentieth years (see note on

1336 b 37). We do not learn when the youth of Aristotle's ' best State ' were to begin their military training, but they would not do so apparently till after twenty-one. Plato in the Laws ( 833 D , 834 A) abolishes the heavier kind of gymnastic contests at festivals, such as wrestling and the pancration, but this is perhaps in part because he is legislating for Cretans.
7. ă $\mu \alpha$ үà $\rho$ к.т.д. See vol. i. p. 359, note $\mathbf{I}$. This rule does not seem to be observed among ourselves. Much hard work is done on the river and in the football-field by youths who are preparing for difficult examinations. In a lecture before the Sanitary Congress at Brighton in 1890 the late Sir B. Richardson pointed out that in those occupations in which ' mental and bodily work was combined, the strain was most intense, and that those sorts of work should never be carried into weariness' (Times, Sept. r. 1890).
12. каì трótepov, in c. 3.1337 b 27 sqq. C. 5.
13. For évóóruov see Bon. Ind. s. v., where the passage before us is grouped with Rhet. 3. 14. 1415 a 5 sqq., in which passage

 probably means 'study it' (cp. $\pi a \Delta \delta \varepsilon \in \dot{\varepsilon} \epsilon \nu, 27$, and see note on 1337 b 29). This question must be settled in order that we may ascertain how music is to be studied, for if it is to be studied for the sake of recreation, the tunes and rhythms to be practised by the pupil will be quite other than those which will be practised by him if it is to be studied for the sake of virtue or intellectual enjoyment. A classification of studies into ai $\hat{\eta} \theta_{0} \pi o o o i$, ai $\pi \rho o े s$
 $\lambda_{\text {e } \gamma \dot{\sigma} \mu \epsilon \nu a \iota ~}$ is implied in Plut. Themist. c. 2-a classification which recalls to some extent that in the passage before us. Compare also the witticism of Dorion, a musician and bon vivant of Aristotle's
 каì є̇̀шхíav кaì $\theta \epsilon \omega$ piav (Athen. Deipn. 337 e).


 кaì ai àpaáaúgets кaì $\dot{\delta}$ ürvos $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\eta} \partial \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, and De Somno et Vigilia 2. 455 b 20 sqq .

тaûta үàp к.т...., ' for these things are not in themselves connected with virtue, but are pleasurable and at the same time " bid care to
cease," as Euripides says, [and therefore they are used with a view to relaxation].' For $\tau \omega \hat{\nu} \boldsymbol{\sigma \pi o v o ̀ a i \omega \nu , ~ c p . ~ T h e o g n . ~ I x 5 , ~}$



 followed by ả̀入á, cp. 7 (5). 8. 1 308 b in sqq., Magn. Mor. 2. 6. 1203 b 1о, 'A $\theta$. Пол. с. 16. 1. 8, and with Kaibel (Stil und Text der


 on the passage in his edition of the Metaphysics). Aristotle has Eurip. Bacch. $33^{2}$ Bothe ( 377 Dindorf) before him, where we read of Bromius,
 grouped together. The same is the case in Hom. Il. 13. $6_{3} 6$ (cp. Lucian, De Saltat. c. 23),

 and Odyss. 8. 248,


Cp. also Athen. Deipn. 40 a.

 $\mu \epsilon \tau \in \in \notin \epsilon \nu($ sc. $\pi a ́ v \tau \omega \nu)$ ) c. 7.1342 a 14, where $\pi a ́ v \tau a s$ must be supplied



 that dancing is a cure for care. The sight of dancing must



$\pi \iota \omega \dot{\omega}$. He goes further in c. 81, and claims that it has a good ethical effect on the spectator.
 is answered in 1340 b 10 sqq. 'A $\rho \epsilon \tau \eta \nu$, , moral virtue,' is represented by $\pi a \delta 0$ ciav in c. 5 . 1339 b 13 (cp. c. 7. 1341 b 38), for education is commonly connected by Aristotle with the production
 (áphoviats $\chi р \eta \sigma \tau$ е́थv).
26. фpóฑŋow, 'intellectual culture': see Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2. 2. $77^{2.3}$ (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., 2. 309. 3), and Sus. ${ }^{2}$, Note 1023 (Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. p. $5^{85}$ ), who rightly defend the words kai $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ ф \rho o ́ v \eta \sigma \iota v ~ a g a i n s t ~ t h o s e ~ w h o ~ w o u l d ~ e x p u n g e ~ t h e m ~$ or change $\phi \rho o{ }^{\nu} \eta \sigma \boldsymbol{v}$ into év $\phi \rho o \sigma \dot{v} \nu \eta \nu$. That the study of music may contribute to intellectual virtue is implied in c. 6. 1341 b 6 sq., and that intellectual virtue is the ultimate end of education we see from $4^{(7)}$ ) 15. 1334 b 14 sqq. For the use of $\phi \rho o ́ v \eta \sigma \iota s$ in this sense, see Bon. Ind. 83 I b 4 sqq.

трíтоv тढ̂v єip $\quad \uparrow \mu \in ้ v \omega$, 'third among the aims which have been enumerated ': see Vahlen on Poet. 3. 1448 a 19.
öt $\mu \epsilon ̀ \nu$ oû̀ k.r.入. Mè̀ oủv is answered by ả̉גà $\mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, 29. Stallbaum on Plato, Protag. 326 A, compares Xen. Cyrop. 2. 2. 14, клav́ $\mu a \sigma \iota$
 Өà $\mu$ аӨ́n $\mu \tau \pi a$. Is Aristotle here tacitly correcting Plato, Laws 8 I9 B,



 оข̇év ?

 4 (7). II. I33I a 7. Eucken (De Partic. Usu, p. I5) has anticipated me in comparing these passages.









VOL. III.
31. ${ }^{2} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ "ै $\sigma \omega s$ к.т. $\lambda$. The sense is-but perhaps the toils of boyhood in learning to play may, notwithstanding what has been said, be for the sake of pastime, not indeed for the sake of pastime in youth, but for the sake of pastime in manhood. The Lacedaemonian Leotychidas, the first in the royal line to bear this name at Sparta, in answer to the question, Tí $\delta \in i ́ q u a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a ~ \mu a \nu \theta a ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \tau o u ̀ s ~$
 (Plut. Apophth. Lac. Leotych. 3), and Aristippus replied to a similar


 is somewhat of a paradox: cp. Eth. Nic. 10. 6. II76 b 32, orovóá-

 had $\mu$ ovorovpyoi attached to their court (Xen. Cyrop.4.6.II). Compare



 $\chi \epsilon \rho \rho \frac{\rho}{} \boldsymbol{\gamma}$ So we have in Eth. Nic. 10. 10. 1180 a 30, סpâv aủvò סóvarӨau, and in Plato, Rep. 498 A , ä $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu \tau o v ̂ \tau o ~ \pi \rho a \tau \tau o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu . ~$






39. Tà rolaûta, 'things such as have been mentioned,' but what things are meant? 'Things which will be a source of pleasure in after-years' (so Vict.), or 'things which afford pleasure' (Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ), or 'musical performances' (Welldon)? The question is not free from doubt, but I incline to the third interpretation, as $\tau a \hat{\tau} \tau a$ in 42
 $\beta \in \lambda \tau i \omega$ тоєєîv.

каi $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \tau \omega ิ \nu ~ o ै \psi ~} \psi \omega \nu \pi \rho \alpha \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon i ́ a \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Richards is probably right in adding $\tau a ́$ before $\pi \epsilon \rho i ́$ (see critical note), though we expect
 $\pi \epsilon p \grave{\tau} \tau \grave{\nu} \tau \bar{\omega} \nu$ ö $\psi \omega \nu \nu \pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon i a \nu$. If the reading of the MSS. is retained, ö $\psi a$ or some such word must be supplied with maparкєvá̧etv. Bonitz
（Ind．s．v．）explains $\pi \rho a \gamma \mu a \tau \epsilon i a$ as＇rei alicuius tractatio via ac ratione instituta．＇Парабкєvá\}єıv is especially used of cooks: cp. Plato,

 music is a source of refreshment and pleasure to grown－up men． But it was regarded by the Greeks as work for slaves（1．7． 1255 b



 Sextus Empiricus this passage of the Politics before him in Adv． Math．6．33，каì ठıà тои̂то $\mu \dot{\eta}$ тотє，ồ тро́тоע $\chi \omega \rho \grave{s}$ ỏ $\psi a \rho \tau v \tau \iota \kappa \eta ̂ s ~ к а i ̀ ~$
 $\dot{\eta} \sigma \theta \epsilon i \eta \mu \epsilon \nu$ à̀ тє $\tau \pi \nu о \hat{u} \mu \epsilon ́ \lambda o v s$ àkоv́бavтєs？

42．тaûta，i．e．musical performances．
 ó $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s \quad \tau \epsilon$ Хaipєıv kaì ó $\rho \theta \hat{\omega} s$ крivetv，or in other words to learn to

 1337 b 3 I，and see note on 1281 a 26.

2．ékeivol үà $\rho$ к．т．入．Athenaeus may have this passage before


 learnt to sing（Plut．Lycurg．c．2 I），and we read in c．6．I341 a 33 of one Spartan at any rate who had learned to play on the aú入ós－ indeed，the Peripatetic Chamaeleon，a pupil of Aristotle，asserted that at one time they commonly learnt to play on the av̉ós（Athen． Deipn． 184 d）－－but it would seem that in Aristotle＇s day they did not commonly learn to play on any instrument．

7．oủ $\gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho$ ó Zeùs к．т．$\lambda$ ．It is Apollo，not Zeus，whom the poets represent as singing and playing on the harp（Eurip．Ion 827
 older poetic descriptions，however，according to Preller，Griech． Mythologie 1． 215 ，Apollo does not sing but only plays，while the Muses sing to his playing（e．g．in Hesiod，Scut．Herc． 201 sqq．）． For тoîs тo七ๆтaîs，see Kühner，Ausführl．gr．Gramm．，ed．2，§ $423 \cdot 3$ ， where Plato，Rep． $3{ }^{8} 9 \mathrm{E},{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{O} \mu \eta \rho \varphi$ ，and Laws 706 D ，av่ $\frac{1}{}$ ，are com－ pared．Vahlen（Beitr．zu Aristot．Poet．4．417）compares Poet． 18.
 $\tilde{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ इофоклєi.. Aristotle elsewhere uses the form ậ $\delta \epsilon \iota \nu$ : he may possibly use $a_{\epsilon} \epsilon \boldsymbol{\delta} \epsilon \iota \nu$ here because he is quoting from a poet.
9. тoùs toloútous, i. e. tov̀s ả́íßovtas кaì kı日apígovtas. In Hom. Odyss. 17. $3^{82}$ sqq. the a aoıós is counted among $\delta \eta \mu \iota o u p y o i . ~ C o m-~$ pare Croesus' advice to Cyrus as to the Lydians (Hdt. 1. 155 ),




каì тò тра́ттєเv к.т.入. Cp. Hom. Odyss. 14. 463,
oìvos $\gamma$ à $\rho$ ảעผ'jє



13. maifєíav. See above on 1339 a 2 I. Hatঠєiav corresponds to

14. єis mávta tátтєтal. Cp. Eth. Nic. 1. 9. 1099 b 7 , ö $\theta \in \nu$ єis

15. $\mu \in \tau \in ́ X \in L v$, sc. $\pi$ ávt $\quad$. See above on 1339 a 19.
 is for the sake of relaxation and relaxation must be pleasurable, for it is a cure for the pain which is produced by toil, [and things are cured by their contraries].' For the famous principle that things are cured by their contraries, cp. Eth. Nic. 2. 2. 1104 b I7, iarpeial yáp
 and 4. II. II26a 2 I sq. Aristotle inherits this principle from Hippocrates: cp. Hippocr. Aphorism. vol. iii. p. 714 Kühn, àmò $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma$ -
 $\pi \lambda \eta \sigma \mu \circ \nu \dot{\eta}, \kappa a i ̀ \tau \omega \nu \nu \not \partial \lambda \lambda \omega \nu \dot{\eta} \dot{v} \pi \epsilon \nu a \nu \tau i \omega \sigma t s$, and De Natura Hominis, vol. i. p. 36I Kühn. Compare with тìv $\delta^{\prime}$ àvánavaıv к.т. . Pindar, Nem. 4. x,
 iatpós.
In the passage before us and in c. 3.1337 b $3^{6}$ sqq. we get a glimpse of Aristotle's Theory of Relaxation, if he can be said to have one. The essential thing about relaxation is that it must be pleasurable. Toil causes pain and pain is cured by its opposite ; hence if the pain of toil is cured by relaxation, relaxation must be pleasurable. Play is a means of relaxation, but there are other means also-sleep and conviviality ( 1339 a 16 sqq.). Sleep and conviviality heal care as well as the pain of toil (ibid.); whether
play does so we are not told. Play, unlike sleep, involves movement ( 4 ( 7 ). 17. 1336 a 26 sqq.); it may even be toilsome, though it is a cure for toil ( 1336 a 28 sqq.). Unlike sleep, again, it may be of a right or a wrong kind ethically; it may, for instance, be illiberal (I336 a 29 : cp. Eth. Nic. 4. 14. 1128 a 17 Sqq.) ; hence it may affect the character for good or ill. In infancy no toil is undergone, so that the play of infancy does not come as a relaxation after toil. Aristotle distinguishes diagogê from relaxation, for though diagogê is pleasurable, it has in it an element of tò калóv which relaxation has not ( 1339 b 17 sqq.). We may probably infer that diagogê will not serve as relaxation. Does it need to be followed by relaxation as à $\chi^{0}$ día does? Aristotle does not consider this question, but the answer to it is probably in the negative. It is true that the activities called into play in diagogê are activities of so high a kind (see note on 1333 a 35) that they may well cause fatigue needing to be removed by relaxation, but we must remember on the other hand that Aristotle regards them as pleasurable (c. 5 . ${ }^{1} 339 \mathrm{~b}$ 17 sqq.) and desirable for their own sake. 'Arxo八ia is accompanied by pain (c. 3. 1337 b 39), and hence the need that it should be followed by relaxation.
 paniment of diagogê,] consists of both these things.' See vol. i.
 tivau Tì̀ eiouunoviav. That happiness is an accompaniment of diagogê, we see from c. 3 . $1333^{8}$ a 1 sqq.
20. кaì $\psi \lambda \grave{\eta} \nu$ oûcav. Plato (Laws 669 D sqq.) objects to $\psi i \lambda \grave{\eta}$
 fere Archilochi' (cp. Athen. Deipn. 637 f ), 'atque $\psi i \lambda \eta \dot{\eta} \nu ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ sub initium Pythiadum exercuit Sacadas' (Stallbaum on Laws 669 D).
21. Mouraios. See note in Sus. ${ }^{4}$.
22. кaì eis tàs $\quad$ vurouoías кaì $\delta \iota a y \omega \gamma$ ás. See critical note on 1330 b 3 r.
 pleasantness. Пatठévé $\theta a t$ is probably middle: $\mathrm{cp} .1340 \mathrm{~b} \mathbf{1 3}$.
25. öra үàp к.т...,, 'for things harmlessly pleasant, [of which music is one,] are suitable not only for the end' (i.e. happiness), 'but also for relaxation.' That the pleasure derived from music is harmless had already been said by Plato (Laws $67 \circ \mathrm{D}$, íva . . .
 also connected harmless pleasure with pastime in Laws 667 E ,


 $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \pi o i a \nu ~ a ́ p \mu o ́ t \tau \epsilon \iota ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \iota \nu, ~ a n d ~ I s o c r . ~ A d ~ N i c o c l . ~ § ~ 34 . ~$
 тaîs $\mathfrak{\eta}$ orovaîs ('dum versantur in voluptatibus,' Stallbaum), and 84 I C,

29. oủx öซov ėmi $\pi \lambda \in \in \circ$, apparently 'not merely with a view to a further end' (Vict. 'non ut plus inde capiant'). I have not happened to meet with a parallel to this use of $\epsilon \pi i \lambda \pi \lambda \epsilon \rho$. For oủ örov in the sense of 'not only,' cp. Thuc. 4. 62.2 (Liddell and Scott).
30. Stavataúecv, 'to let them rest awhile' (Liddell and Scott).
31. $\sigma u \mu \beta \epsilon ́ \beta \eta \kappa є$ סè к.т. $\lambda$. The meaning is-but men are not content with using pastime as a means of obtaining the relaxation and pleasure of which they often stand in need ; they fall into the error of confounding it with the end of life, and seek happiness in the pleasures arising from it. Pastime is $\chi \rho \eta \eta^{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\mu}(\mathrm{I} 339 \mathrm{~b} 30$ ), or in other words a means to the end (Eth. Nic. 8. 2. 1155 b 19 sq. :
 regarding it thus, they take it to be the end of life.
33. ả $\lambda \lambda$ ' oủ $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \cup \chi \not ิ \hat{u} \sigma \alpha \nu$, 'but not any chance kind of pleasure.' Prof. Butcher (Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, ed. 2,


 Aristotle perhaps has before him Plato, Laws $658 \mathrm{E}, \sigma v \gamma \chi \omega \rho \hat{\omega}$ oì ró



 the end) 'they take the other' (i.e. the pleasure of pastime) 'as


36. ai тoเaûtaı tิิv $\dot{\eta} \delta o \nu \omega \hat{\nu}$, 'the pleasures we have mentioned,' i.e. the pleasures of pastime. Cp. Eth. Nic. 10. 6.1176 b 9, каi $\tau \omega ิ \nu$



38. For the needless addition of aitiav in the relative sentence,


 sqq.: Pol. 4 (7). 2. 1324 a 23 sqq. and 4 (7). 4. 1326 b 7 sqq. : 5 (8). 5. 1340 a $32-34: 6$ (4). 4. 1291 b 10: 6 (4). 12. T296 b 19 sqq.
40. $\pi \in \rho i$ i $\delta$ è toû kotvшvєîv к.т.入. Compare the similarly anacolu-




 comes to the surface, as it were, in the next sentence. Kovvoveiv



 trast is here drawn between the accidents of a thing and its nature or essence ( $\phi \dot{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ s = ovoria, see Bon. Ind. 545 b 23 sqq., where
 фúvel övтตv ouvia, is referred to among other passages). For the

2. kai $\delta \in i ̂$ к.т.入. Cp. c. 6. I34I a 15 sqq. and Probl. 28. 7. 1340 a.

 $\dot{\epsilon} \pi$ оveiòrotol. The many know not what true pleasure is (Eth. Nic.

 Aristotle implies that this кowv̀ $\dot{\eta} \delta o v \dot{\eta}$ does not affect the character or the soul; he probably regards it as pleasure of a merely physical kind. For the view that pleasure which comes by nature is common to all, cp. Eth. Nic. 3.13 .1118 b 8, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\circ}$ èm $\pi \theta \nu \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ ai

 Phys. 8. 7.26 I b 25 sq., and Plato, Laws 963 E. Cp. also Diphilus, Подлтра́ү $\mu \omega \nu$ Fragm. I (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 4. 407),


5. $\bar{\alpha} \lambda \lambda^{\prime}$ ò $\rho \hat{a} \nu$ к.т. $\lambda$. Sepulv. 'sed etiam videre numquid ad mores



 $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \nu \dot{\eta} \theta_{0 v s}$, and see note on 1337 a 38 : cp. also Plato, Symp.


 тєivovai $\pi \eta$ каi $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{a} \eta \eta \theta \eta$. For the repetition of the preposition see critical note on 133I b 24. Plato had already said in Rep. 40 I D,







 סéóorat. Both these passages are probably present to Aristotle's mind here.
9. Sı̀̀ $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ 'O入úptrou $\mu \in \lambda \omega \hat{\nu}$. Eaton refers to Plato, Symp.

 $\tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \tau \omega ิ \nu$ סєoнévovs סıà tò $\theta \epsilon i ̂ a ~ \epsilon i ̂ v a ı . ~ B e r n a y s ~(G r u n d z u ̈ g e ~ d e r ~ v e r-~$ lorenen Abhandlung des Aristoteles über Wirkung der Tragödie, Note 5) uses the passage before us to show that, when in c. 7. 1342 a 8 sqq. Aristotle describes the effect of $\tau \dot{a}$ i $\in \rho \dot{a} ~ \mu € \lambda \eta$, it is to these melodies of Olympus that he mainly refers. See as to them Sus. ${ }^{4}$, 1. 621 sq.
 affects $\tau \dot{o} \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s \dot{\eta} \theta o s$, therefore he has to prove that the $\epsilon^{\epsilon} v \theta o v-$ $\sigma \iota a \sigma \mu o ́ s$ which it admittedly produces is an affection of rò $\tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \bar{\eta} s$ $\hat{\eta} \theta o s$. Some may have regarded it as a $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu ~ \pi a ́ \theta o s, ~ l i k e ~ t h e ~$ $\pi \dot{a} \theta \eta$ referred to in Eth. Nic. 10. 2. 1173b 8 sqq., and others as a special condition of the voûs (cp. Plato, Ion 534 B , кои̂фov yà $\rho$


 but Aristotle regards it as connected with an impulse to action


and this is perhaps the reason why he here traces it to $\tau \dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi u \chi \hat{\eta} s$
 compares Rhet. 2. 9. 1386 b 12 , where тò $\epsilon \lambda \lambda \epsilon \epsilon i \hat{\nu}$ and $\tau o ̛ \nu \epsilon \mu \epsilon \sigma a ̂ \nu$ are





 the aid of melody or rhythm call forth in every one the feelings which they imitate (see vol. i. p. 362 , note 3 ). Thus a single note from the pitch-pipe of a slave was enough to restore calmness and gentleness to the tones of C. Gracchus' oratory when they became harsh and angry (Plut. De Cohib. Ira, c. 6). Aristotle has just been dwelling on the effect of the melodies of Olympus, and he now adds this remark in order to guard against the supposition that the effect produced by music on $\tau \dot{o} \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s \hat{\eta} \theta o s$ is due not to its power of imitating ethical states, but to its accompaniments of melody and rhythm. Plato had spoken in Rep. 40 I D (see note on 5) as if this was so. Aristotle appears to imply here that the musical imitation of ethical states is possible without the use of rhythm and melody; hence, when in c. 7 . I 34 I b 23 he speaks as if music was confined to $\mu \in \lambda o \pi o t i a$ and $\dot{\rho} u \theta \mu o ́ s$, we must suppose that he refers to music in a somewhat narrower sense.
14. є̇דєi $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \quad \sigma u \mu \beta \epsilon ́ \beta \eta \kappa \in \nu$ к.т.入., 'but since it happens that music belongs to the class of pleasant things, [so that it calls forth feelings of pleasure, and pleasure may be called forth by the right or the wrong objects,] and virtue is concerned with taking pleasure aright and loving and hating aright, it is evident that we ought to learn and to be habituated to nothing so much as to judging aright and taking pleasure in good characters and noble actions, [because it is thus that men learn virtue].' Aristotle proceeds in what follows to show that music is capable of teaching men to take pleasure in noble characters and actions, or in other words to be virtuous (cp. 1340 b 10 sqq.). MavӨávetv is distinguished from

 є́ $\theta i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ and àкои́єıข.
 are images, most nearly approaching the reality, of anger and
gentleness，＇etc．It is thus that Sepulveda（＇proxime ad veras naturas accedunt＇），Vict．（＇maxime secundum veras naturas＇）， Stahr，and Sus．interpret $\mu a ́ \lambda \iota \sigma \tau a$ $\pi a \rho a ̀ ̀ ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a ̀ ̀ \eta \theta \iota v a ̀ s ~ \phi u ́ \sigma \epsilon t s: ~ c p . ~$ Top．8．14．164 b 19 ，ék $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi a \rho \grave{~} \pi o \delta o ̂ a s, ~ ' t h i n g s ~ c l o s e ~ t o ~ t h e ~ f e e t . ' ~ '$ Compare Alcidamas，De Sophistis，p．88，$\mu \mu \mu \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau a \tau \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \lambda \eta \theta t \nu \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\sigma \omega \mu$ ít $\omega$ v，and for фú $\sigma$ ets（with Bon．Ind． 838 b 55），Phys．4． 6.
 who here has before him Plato，Rep． 399 A sqq．（where however only divopia and $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma i v \eta \eta$ are referred to，not $\pi \rho a o ́ r \eta s)$ ，and Laws $6_{54} \mathrm{E}, 6_{55} \mathrm{~B}$ ，and 798 D ，appears to imply that the images of emotions and ethical states conveyed in melody and rhythm approach nearer to the original than those conveyed for instance in poetry，except so far as poetry is associated with melody and rhythm．The question might be asked why the young should not be taught to take pleasure in good characters and good acts by a training concerning itself directly with that subject－matter and not merely with images of it，but Aristotle would probably reply that there would not be the same pleasurableness in a training of that kind as there is in a musical training，and that it would not fulfil the end of accustoming the young to take pleasure in the right things．

20．каi $\pi \alpha ́ \mu \tau \omega v ~ \tau \hat{v} v$ ęvavtíuv roútoss．Aristotle implies that musical imitations not only of cowardice but also of d́ко入aনia，the opposite of $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \sigma i v \eta$ ，are possible．Music can certainly at any rate imitate $\boldsymbol{v} \beta$ piss．
 そう七ós）．

22．$\mu \in \tau \alpha \beta \alpha \dot{\lambda} \lambda \lambda_{0} \mu \epsilon \nu \gamma \grave{\alpha} \rho \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \psi u x \grave{\eta} \nu$ ，i．e．we experience emotional change ：cp．（with Vahlen，Beitr．zu Aristot．Poet．3．336）Rhet． 2.

 тоוаûta，каi тà тоútoıs є́vaעtia．
23．тооoút $\omega V$ ，sc．$\dot{\rho} v \theta \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ кaì $\mu \bar{\omega} \omega \hat{\omega}$ ．
25．oiov єì tis к．т．ג．For the thought cp．De Part．An．r． 5 ． 645 a 10 sqq ．
 if a man took pleasure in an image（for example）on account of the beauty or costliness of its material，he might not take equal pleasure in the thing of which it is an image．Cp．Poet．4． 1448 b 15 ，סum




27. aủगทे Éкєívŋv. Bekk. ${ }^{2}$ adopts the emendation of Lambinus and Scaliger, à̀voû ėkeivov, perhaps rightly. If we retain av̇riv Ėxeivqv, we must supply roúrov as the antecedent to ov̂.
28. $\sigma \nu \mu \beta \in \beta \eta_{\kappa є} \delta$ ѐ к.т.ג. Eaton and Prof. Butcher (Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, ed. 2, p. 132 sq.) compare Probl-



 Prof. Butcher points out that these passages exaggerate the true Aristotelian view, as they deny all ethical suggestiveness to sight as
 sensible things than things audible') is taken up not by à $\lambda \lambda \alpha_{a}, 3^{\circ}$,

 this power' (i.e. the power of imitating emotions and ethical states), ' but only to a small extent, and all, [even children and worthless men,] share in the perception just referred to.' The painterParrhasius denied in a conversation with Socrates (Xen. Mem. 3. 10. 3) that painting can imitate the character of the soul ( $\left.\tau \dot{o} \tau \hat{\eta} s \psi v \chi \hat{\eta} s{ }_{j}{ }^{\prime} \theta o s\right)$, but was led on by Socrates to a different conclusion (Xen. Mem. 3. 10. 5, à̀ $\lambda \grave{\alpha}$



 Kai $\mu a ́ \lambda a, ~ \breve{\epsilon} \phi \eta)$. Plato went further (Rep. 400 Esq.) and found not only painting, but also weaving, embroidery, building, and the forms of vessels and of animals and plants, full of ethical suggestiveness, but Aristotle rates the ethical suggestiveness of forms and colours lower and finds such suggestiveness, it would seem, only in the human body under the influence of emotion (compare the passage of Xenophon quoted above), or in representations of it. See vol. i. p. 363 , note 5 . As to кai $\pi$ áv $\tau \epsilon s ~ \tau \eta ̂ s ~ \tau o a v i ́ t \eta s ~ a i \sigma \theta \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \omega s ~$ кolv $\omega$ ขoṽrıv, see note on $\mathrm{I}_{3} 40$ a 2 , and vol. i. p. $3^{6} 3$, note 3 . Spengel
 E. Müller inserts oủ before $\pi$ ávers, 3 r. If any change in the text is necessary, of which I do not feel certain, I prefer the former change
to the latter, but it would also be possible to add a second emi $\mu \kappa \rho o ́ v$ after $\pi a ́ v \tau \epsilon s, 3$ I. Forms and colours are mentioned as examples of tà ópatá: cp. Eth. Nic. 3. 13. 1118 a 3 , toìs oià $\tau \hat{\eta} s$

32. $\vec{\epsilon} \tau \iota \delta \dot{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\lambda$. For the distinction between copies and symbolic representations of an original, see Prof. Butcher, Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, ed. 2, p. 124, who refers to Teichmüller, Aristotelische Forschungen, z. $\mathbf{1 4 5}^{-1} 54$, where the subject is fully discussed. 'A sign or symbol has no essential resemblance, no natural connexion, with the thing signified.' Aristotie does not say that painting and sculpture can give only symbolic representations of all that they imitate, but that it is only in this way that they can
 seems to refer to forms and colours in pictures and statues (for we
 $\sigma \chi$ ŋ́ $\mu a \sigma t$, cp. Plato, Rep. 373 B), not to attitudes and colours in living
 afterthought in explanation of $\tau a \hat{v} \tau a$ very much as $\dot{\eta} \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \eta \eta_{\nu} \tau \rho \circ \not \dot{\eta}_{\eta}^{\nu}$ is added in 1. 9. 1258 a 16 sqq.: cp. also [Demosth.] c. Aristog.

 in 33 and 34 see critical notes on 1276 a 21 and 1319 a 33 , and explanatory note on 1284 b 28 .
 this to mean, 'and these indications of character occur [only] in the case of the body under the influence of emotions, [so that it is not forms in general, but only a particular kind of forms, that are even indications of character].' I explained this obscure clause otherwise, though with much hesitation, in vol. i. p. 363 . For the suppression of ' only,' see note on 1282 a 36 . For $\epsilon \pi i \grave{\imath}$ rov̂ $\sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a z o s$




 however, there seems to be ethical suggestiveness in architecture.
 makes a difference in relation to the contemplation of these things also [whether we contemplate one thing or another],' etc. By 'these things ' Aristotle means forms and colours.



 ópoious єika̧єv. In this, we learn from what follows, Polygnotus found a parallel in Homer and Pauson in poets far inferior to Homer. In the passage before us it is implied that Pauson was not $\grave{\eta} \theta_{c}$ ós, and according to Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. p. 624, Aristotle means by 'an artist "full of character" ( $\eta \theta_{\text {coós })}$ ' one who 'represents noble characters.' The word $\dot{\eta} \theta$ tкós appears to bear this meaning here

 'expressive of ethical character' as distinguished from 'emotional.' In Poet. 6. 1450 a 26 we read of Polygnotus, oiov кaì т $\omega \nu$ үраф'́ $\omega \nu$

 the sculptors referred to as $\eta \theta$ ıкoi : cp. Plut. De Alex. seu Virtute

 av̉тov̂ кaì $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon \xi \in \notin \phi \epsilon \rho \epsilon \tau \hat{\eta} \mu о \rho \phi \hat{\eta} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \epsilon \tau \eta \eta^{\nu}$. As to the skill of Polygnotus in portraying character, see Brunn, Gesch. der gr. Künstler 2. 40. There were paintings by Polygnotus at Athens in the Stoa Poecilê, in the Anaceium, in a chamber of the Propylaea, and elsewhere, so that his work must have been familiar to Aristotle's hearers. As to Pauson, see Brunn 2. 49 sqq. and Overbeck, Schriftquellen, p. 212 , both of whom take Aristophanes to refer to him in Acharn. $8_{54}$, Thesmoph. 948 sq., and Plut. 602. If they are right in this, Pauson would seem to have been a contemporary of Aristophanes.
 apart from anything else, apart from the person of the singer and from the words sung. Forms and colours, on the other hand, are suggestive of character only in the case of the body under the influence of emotion.
40. єủقùs $\gamma$ àp к.т. $\lambda .$, 'for, to begin with, the nature of harmonies, [which are elements in melody,] is different.' Aristotle goes on to show in 1340 b 7 sqq. that the same thing holds of rhythms, and probably he regarded a melody as made up of harmony and rhythm, just as Plato, who, unlike Aristotle (c. 5. 1339 b 20), did not approve of $\psi \iota \lambda \grave{\eta} \mu \sigma v \sigma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ (Laws 669 D sq.), regarded it as made up of words, harmony, and rhythm (Rep. 398 D ). If harmonies
affect the $\bar{j} \theta o s$ of the hearer differently, it follows that they differ in $\dot{\eta} \theta$ os and are $\mu \mu \mu \dot{\eta} \mu a \tau a \tau \omega ิ \nu \dot{\eta} \theta \hat{\omega} \nu$. The word $\dot{\alpha} \rho \mu o v i a ~ h a d ~ m o r e ~ m e a n-~$ ings than one (Monro, The Modes of Ancient Greek Music, p. 56), but it is evidently used here of the Dorian, Phrygian, and other 'modes,' whatever we take their nature to have been. On this disputed question see (in addition to Sus. ${ }^{4}$, I. p. 624 sqq.) the work of Mr. Monro just referred to, Mr. H. Stuart Jones' review of it in Class. Rev. 8.448 sqq., and Mr. Monro's reply (ibid. 9.79 sqq.).

 and see Vahlen on this passage. For the fact cp. Sext. Empir. Adv.





 à $\gamma \epsilon \nu \nu \bar{\eta}$.




 èmtetкeis єivat, $\mu \grave{\eta}$ ört à àdóáatv (possibly a hit at Sappho, who is credited with the invention of the mixo-Lydian mode by Aristoxenus ap. Plut. De Mus. c. 16), and Laws 800 D, đârav


 also has before him Pratinas ap. Athen. Deipn. 624 f (Pratinas, Fragm. 5),

 where, as Sus. ${ }^{4}$ points out, the Aeolian mode is described as intermediate between 'high-pitched Ionian ' and 'low Ionian.' Pratinas, however, declares in favour, not of the Dorian mode, as Aristotle, but of the Aeolian, later called the hypo-Dorian according to Athen. Deipn. 625 a.
 compress and joy to expand the mind: cp. Eurip. Alcest. 771

Bothe ( 797 Dindorf), тov̂ עv̂ע $\sigma \kappa \nu \theta \rho \omega \pi o v ิ ~ к a i ̀ ~ \xi u v є \sigma \tau \hat{\omega} \tau o s ~ \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu$, and Hippol. 937 Bothe ( 983 Dindorf), $\mu$ évos $\mu \hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ そ̇v $\sigma \tau a \sigma i s ~ \tau \epsilon \sigma \hat{\omega} \nu \phi \rho \epsilon \nu \omega ̂ \nu$, and Cic. Tusc. Disp. 4. 3 1. 66, eodem enim vitio est effusio animi in laetitia quo in dolore contractio. So the Stoics defined $\lambda u ́ \pi \eta$ as
 II4: see Pearson, Fragments of Zeno and Cleanthes, p. 180). In Laws 800 D (quoted above) Plato had spoken of the $\psi v x \dot{\eta}$ generally, but Aristotle here speaks more particularly of the סıávota as affected by the various musical modes (cp. 1340 b 2 ); he regards it as susceptible of compression and relaxation, two extreme states, and also of a mean state of calm. He was led by a false etymology of the Greek word $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta$ to connect wisdom and knowledge with

 this is perhaps one reason why he selects the composed and collected Dorian mode for use in education. He feels that anything which calms is useful both morally and intellectually. In Aesch. Suppl. 69,
ठánт $\omega$ тà $\nu$ á $\pi a \lambda a ̀ \nu \nu \epsilon \iota \lambda o \theta \in \rho \hat{\eta} \pi a \rho \epsilon \iota a ́ \nu$,
the high-pitched variety of the Ionian mode is probably referred to. This variety, which some identify with the mixo-Lydian (see Sus. ${ }^{4}$, I. 625 sqq .), appears to have been expressive of lamentation.
2. $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \delta e ̀ ~ t a ̀ s ~ \mu a \lambda a \kappa \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho \omega s ~ t \eta ̀ \nu ~ \delta \iota a ́ v o i \alpha \nu, ~ o i ̂ o \nu ~ \pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ a ̉ v \epsilon \iota \mu \epsilon ́ v a s . ~ 1340 ~ b . ~$ Aristotle probably refers to the softer varieties of the Ionian and Lydian modes: cp. Plato, Rep. 398 E, where these varieties (if we follow Mr. H. Stuart Jones' interpretation of the passage in Class. Rev. 8. 449, note) are said to be $\mu$ алакаі каì оvдтотıкаí.
3. $\mu \notin \sigma \omega s$ каì ка日धбтทкóт $\omega \mathrm{s}$, 'in a midway state of collectedness and composure' : ср. с. 7. 1342 а 1о, каӨıбтанévous, and Plut. De Gen. Socr. c. $3^{2}$, киӨєбтךко́та, and for the conjunction of $\mu \epsilon ́ \sigma \omega s$ and
 and 1240 a 2 sq. KaӨi $2 \pi \tau a \sigma \theta a \iota$ is conjoined with $\sigma \omega \phi \rho o \nu i \zeta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ in Hist. An. 7. I. $5^{82}$ a 25 . As to the Dorian mode, cp. c. 7. 1342 b 12 sqq. Plutarch describes the songs sung by the Spartans as
 Ponticus (ap. Athen. Deipn. 624 d ) says of the Dorian mode, $\dot{\eta} \mu \dot{\mu} \nu$




 and c. 7. $134^{2} \mathrm{~b}$ I sqq.
5. $\tau \alpha \hat{u} \tau \alpha$ ү $\dot{\alpha} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle evidently takes his account of the mental effect of each of the harmonies from oi $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \pi a \iota \delta \epsilon i a \nu$ $\tau a v ́ \tau \eta \nu \pi є \phi \lambda \lambda о \sigma о ф \eta к o ́ \tau \epsilon s, ~ ' t h o s e ~ w h o ~ h a d ~ s t u d i e d ~ m u s i c a l ~ e d u c a t i o n . ' ~$ Some musicians (Damon, for instance, as Sus. ${ }^{4}$, x. p. 596 , points out, referring to Plato, Rep. 400 B and 424 C) had probably done this, and also some philosophers (cp. c. 7.134 I b 27 sqq. and $134^{2}$ a 30 sqq.). Among the philosophers would be Plato (Rep. $398 \mathrm{E}-399 \mathrm{~A}$ and elsewhere) and some of his disciples (Plut. De Mus. c. 3 init.), e.g. Heracleides Ponticus, and perhaps, as Eaton says, some Pythagoreans (cp. Plut. De Virt. Mor. c. 3. 44 I E). It has been suggested by Mr. H. Stuart Jones (Class. Rev. 8. 450) that Aristotle's view of the mental effect of the various modes rests on a verbal basis, the word à $\nu \epsilon \mu \in ́ \nu o s$ meaning both 'loosely strung' (or 'low-pitched ') and 'soft, relaxed,' and the word oívrovos both 'highly strung' (or 'high-pitched') and the reverse of 'soft' and 'relaxed '; it appears, however, from the passage before us that his view comes to him from other authorities, so that the verbal confusion supposed to exist would be theirs rather than his. But indeed the emphatic
 suggests that these authorities arrived at their conclusion inductively by watching the effect of the different modes on individual hearers.
6. $\lambda a \mu \beta$ ávouvı $\gamma \dot{\rho} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. Thus they adopt the best method of








 the trochee is кордакєкө́тєроs, it is probably regarded by Aristotle as

 the striking picture in Plut. Sympos. 7. 5. I of the effect produced


 каі̀ тоі̂s $\mu \in \lambda \epsilon \sigma \nu \nu$. We read in Plato, Rep. 400 B , of àvє $\lambda \epsilon v \theta \epsilon$ рias кaì


10. Ėк $\mu$ ย̀v oủv roútcuv к.т.入. Aristotle says nothing about the question raised in c. 5 . 1339 a 25 , whether music contributes to

12. єi $\delta$ ѐ тоиิто к.т.ג. The reason for which Pythagoras employed music in education, according to Plut. De Virt. Mor. c. 3. 44 I E, was akin to this, but not quite the same. Plutarch there says that



 àmeє $\theta$ '́s.







 Fragm. 22 : Muller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 2. 279) that study, if it is to come to anything, must be willingly pursued. Aristotle seems to think so too.
 ré $\chi \nu \eta$ or $\dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau^{\prime} \mu \mu \eta$ ) is $\dot{\eta} \delta \partial \sigma \mu \mu^{\prime} \nu \eta$ because rhythm and harmony and melody go with it (Poet. 6. 1449 b 28 sqq.). In Poet. 6. 1450 b 15
 Prof. Bywater (Journal of Philology, xiv. 1885, p. 42) would read $\dot{\eta} \delta v \sigma \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$ here. 'A $\bar{\eta} \delta \delta \nu \nu \tau o \nu$, however, finds a better antithesis in $\dot{\eta} \delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon ́ \nu \omega \nu$ than in $\dot{\eta} \delta v \sigma \mu \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$.
17. каí тıs є̉oıkє бuүүध́vєıa к.т.入. Supply $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \psi v \chi \eta ́ \nu ~(s e e ~$ Vol. ii., p. li., note 4). The sense is-and not only is music $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\dot{\eta} \delta v \sigma \mu \epsilon \quad \nu \omega \nu$, but it is also akin to the soul (which is not the case with all $\dot{\eta} \delta v \sigma \mu \dot{\epsilon} \nu a)$, and therefore still more congenial to it than those $\dot{\eta} \delta v \sigma \mu \hat{v} \nu a$ which are not akin to it. I cannot follow Sus. in trans-
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 is akin to the soul is likely to be suitable to it (cp. c. 7. 1342 a 25 :


18. $\delta$ เò $\pi$ то入оi к.т.入. The Pythagoreans held that the soul is a harmony, and two of Aristotle's disciples, Aristoxenus and Dicaearchus, followed them in this opinion (see Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. 597, who refers to Zeller, Gr. Ph. 1. 444 and 2.2.888, 890 (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, vol. ii. p. 436 sqq.) : cp. De An. 1. 4.407 b 27 sqq.). The view that the soul has harmony is that of Plato (Phaedo 93 : see Sus. ${ }^{4}$, ibid.). For the two views cp. De Caelo I. 1. 268 a 4, $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu$



C. 6. 20. Xeıpoupyoûvtas takes the place of kitapíSovtas (c. 5. 1339 b 8), partly because Aristotle does not wish to prejudge the question of the aidós, partly because the use of the word $\chi$ tipovpyeiv serves to place in a strong light the doubtfulness of the point, the Greeks being prejudiced against $\chi$ tipovpría. We shall find in the sequel that Aristotle seeks to confine $\chi$ efpovpyia within as narrow limits as possible (cp. 1340 b 35 sqq. and $\mathrm{I}_{34} \mathrm{I}$ b r). He nowhere considers the possible alternative of teaching the young to sing but not to play. The two things usually went together in ancient Greece; so far at any rate as solo-singers were concerned ; the singer was expected to be able to accompany himself on the lyre.
21. $\pi \rho o ́ t \epsilon \rho 0$, in C. 5. I 339 a 33 sqq.


 become $\pi$ oooi $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ es is to acquire a certain ${ }_{\epsilon} \xi_{\xi s}$ (Categ. $8.8 \mathrm{~b}{ }^{2} 5$,

 $\sigma a \nu$ ), and it is by acquiring the appropriate $\delta \dot{v} v a \mu \operatorname{sis}$ or $\tilde{\epsilon}_{\xi} \xi s$ that we become able to judge of things (De An. 3. $3 \cdot 428$ a 3). But the ${ }_{\epsilon} \xi \underline{\xi}$ ts is acquired by practice (Eth. Nic. 2. 1. 1103 a 3 r , cà̀s $\delta^{\prime}$ àpetàs
 Aristotle's language here seems hardly consistent with his language in Pol. 3. 11. 1281b7sq. He does not speak there as if it was
necessary to have learnt to sing and play in order to judge of music aright. We are told, again, in 3. 11. 1282 a 17 sqq. that there are arts in which the user is a better judge than the master of the art. Are we to infer that music is not one of these? Besides, Aristotle's teaching in the passage before us appears to imply that we ought to practise in youth all kinds of music--not merely the ethical kind, which he alone recommends for use in the education of the young (c. $7 \cdot 1342 \mathrm{a} 2$ ), but also practical and enthusiastic airs, for otherwise how can we judge of these aright?-and indeed all arts of the products of which we desire to become good judges (e.g. poetry, painting, sculpture, and architecture, to say nothing of the useful arts). This he does not seem to have observed. His experience as to music evidently was that those who did not practise the art up to a certain point were apt to rest content with music possessing merely a physical charm-the music which pleased slaves and children-and did not acquire a liking for noble music. By 'good judges' Aristotle clearly means not good judges of music from a technical point of view, but men capable of taking pleasure in ethically good music (cp. c. 5. 1340 a 17 and 1339 a 24 ). The difference between $\gamma$ i $\gamma \nu \epsilon \epsilon \theta a t$, 22, and $\gamma \in \nu^{\prime} \epsilon \theta \theta a l, 25$, may be

 § 97.
 of education in keeping boys out of mischief is recognized by Isocrates in Panath. § 27 and Areop. § 45 : cp. Plato, Protag. 326 A . 'Children are sent to school as much to keep them out of harm's way as to prepare them for after-life,' observes a writer in the Academy for Nov. 9, 1895, who probably remembers and extends to all children a remark as to little children which has been pointed out to me in Spectator, No. $33^{\circ}$ (March 19, 1712), 'as little children are sent to school before they are capable of improvement, only to be out of harm's way.'
26. Tìv 'Apxútou $\pi \lambda a \tau a \gamma \eta)^{\prime}$. As to the rattle of Archytas, cp.




 however the invention is ascribed to an Archytas who was a rékr $\tau \nu$ ):

Lucr．5．229．Archytas was fond of playing with children（Aelian， Var．Hist． 12.15 ：Athen．Deipn． 519 b）．пגaaazai，however，appear to have existed before the time of Archytas，for they were known to Hellanicus and to Pherecydes of Athens（see Göttling＇s note on the passage before us，and Hellan．Fragm．61，Pherecyd．Fragm． $3^{2}$ in Müller，Fr．Hist．Gr．1．53，78）．As to the form＇Apxúrov see critical note．

29．oủ ү⿳亠口冋阝 Súvatat tò véov ท̂ouxácelv．Sus．${ }^{4}$ compares Plato，



 тарахі̀ каì $\eta$ кímots，and Plut．Sympos．7．10．1，quoted above on 26.
 present to the mind of the writer of Virg．Catal．7，

Et vos，Stiloque Tarquitique Varroque， Scholasticorum natio madens pingui，
Ite hinc，inane cymbalon iuventutis？


 and answered．

35．$\pi \rho \hat{\omega}$ тov $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \nu \gamma^{\alpha} \rho$ к．，т．．．，＇for first，since it is［only］for the sake of judging of music that they are to practise playing［and not for the sake of perfect mastery of execution］，on account of this they should indeed practise playing in youth，but as they become older， they should be released from playing，and yet be able to distinguish noble airs and to take pleasure in music aright，thanks to the training which they have received in youth．＇Though it is provided here that，as men cease to be youthful，they shall be excused playing on an instrument，singing is apparently contemplated even in the case of aged men in c． 7.1342 b 20 sqq．，if this passage is genuine．Aristotle would seem to be less favourable to playing in the case of adult citizens than many were ：not a few Pythagoreans played on the harp（Cic．Tusc．Disp．5．39．113：Aelian，Var．Hist． 14．23），and on the aủdós（Athen．Deipn．184e），and so did Epami－ nondas（Athen．ibid．：Cic．Tusc．Disp．r．2．4）．Socrates learnt the harp in old age（Diog．Laert．2． 32 ：Val．Max．8．7．Ext．8）．
 This question receives an answer in $134^{1}$ a $5^{-1} 7$. Toîs $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ a ̉ \rho \epsilon \tau \grave{\eta} v$
 excellence as citizens,' and not with a view to excellence as musical executants. По入ıтьк $\eta_{\nu}$ is emphasized by its position in the sentence. So in De Part. An. I. I. 642 a 29 sqq. a contrast is implied between $\dot{\eta} \pi 0 \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \grave{\eta}$ à $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ (including perhaps $\grave{\eta} \theta \iota \grave{j}$ à $\rho \epsilon \tau \dot{\eta}$ and $\phi \rho o ́ \nu \eta \sigma \iota s$ ) and


 $\delta_{1 k a t o \sigma u ́ v \eta s ~ \epsilon ่ \gamma \gamma ı \gamma \nu o \mu e ́ v \eta s, ~ a n d ~ s e e ~ n o t e ~ o n ~}^{1280 \text { b } 5 .}$
 as to the melodies is answered in 134 I a 9 sqq. and in c. 7 . 134 I b 19.sqq., but the question as to the rhythms is not answered in what we possess of the Politics (sce vol. i, p. $3^{67}$, and vol. ii, p. xxviii sq.). We may probably infer, however, from c. 5 . 1340 b 7 sqq. that the rhythms used in education will be oi ${ }^{\epsilon}$ 'Xovтєs $\bar{\eta} \theta o s$ бтаб兀цต́тє $\rho \frac{\nu .}{}$
 ' $\mathrm{E} v$ is used here of the 'medium' of instruction, as it is often used in the Poetics (e.g. in Poet. 1. 1447 b 29) of the medium of imitation (see Eucken, Praepositionen, p. 24 : Bon. Ind. 245 b 42 sqq.) : cp. Plato, Laches, 182 A , oi $\epsilon ้ \nu$ toúrous $\tau o i ̂ s ~ \pi \epsilon p i ̀ ~ \tau o ̀ \nu ~ \pi o ́ \lambda \epsilon \mu o \nu ~$ ó $\rho$ уávots $\gamma v \mu \nu a$ ̧ó $\mu \in \nu o \iota$.
 use of $\tau \rho o ́ \pi o \iota$ in the sense of $\epsilon i \delta \eta$ see Bon. Ind. 772 b 30 sqq.$)$. ot
 referred to: cp. 134 x b 14 sqq.
 the study of music might stand in the way of a citizen's work in after-life without harming the body. It might do so if it lowered the character or enfeebled the intelligence (c. 2. 1337 b 8-11), and this result might well follow if music were studied as festivalperformers study it.


 ably means 'military and civic training,' 'training designed to develope military and civic virtue': cp. 2.9. 127I b 5, $\mu \eta \delta \dot{\epsilon} \dot{\eta} \sigma \kappa \eta \kappa \epsilon ́ \nu a u$



 каi $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota к а ̀ s ~ c ̇ \sigma к \eta ́ \sigma \epsilon \iota s, ~ b u t ~ t h e i r ~ m e a n i n g ~ i s ~ b y ~ n o ~ m e a n s ~ c l e a r . ~$
 ràs $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ (in the sense of doing the thing studied) as one form of the military and civic training referred to and ras $\mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ as another, and regard $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ as preceding $\mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$, because in any training designed to produce good soldiers and citizens practice comes first and instruction in the theory afterwards (cp. c. 3.1338 b 4, Metaph. Ө. 5. 1047 b 3 I sqq., and Eth. Nic. 2. I. IIO3 a $3^{1}$ sqq. and 10 .
 the boys to whom Aristotle refers be said to perform? Bojesen, on the other hand, followed by Sus., interchanges $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ and $\mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$,
 appears from the translation which he gives of the passage to supply $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ каì $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \sigma \kappa \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ with $\mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ and $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$, but the expressions ràs $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ каì $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ ảбк$\dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \omega \nu$ and $\tau \dot{a} s \mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi о \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu$ каi $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{\omega} \nu \quad a \dot{\alpha} \kappa \eta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \nu \nu$ seem rather strange. And, whether we supply these words or not, the question remains, to what $\mu a \theta \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s \pi o \lambda \epsilon \mu \iota к a i$ кai $\pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota к a i$ pursued in boyhood and youth does Aristotle refer? He must apparently refer to the ordinary education in gymnastic, music, etc., for we know of no other which he provides for the young. I am inclined, however, to suggest a different interpretation of the passage before us. Should we not supply $\tau о \hat{v} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau o s$ with $\tau$ às $\chi \rho \dot{\eta} \sigma \epsilon \iota s$ (as Schneider appears to
 and explain the passage thus, 'the study of music in youth must not render the body unfit for military and civic training either by rendering it unfit for such training in a purely physical way' (literally, 'unfit for the uses of the body') 'or by rendering it an unfit assistant for the mind in studies later on'? That the body may be a help or a hindrance to the use of the mind in study we see from Plato, Rep. 498 B and 536 B , and Protag. 326 B sq.: cp. also Magn. Mor. 2. ıo. 1208 a 12 sqq., quoted on 1333 a 2 I.

10. Tท̀v $\mu \dot{a} \theta \eta \sigma \iota v, ~ ' t h e ~ s t u d y ~ o f ~ m u s i c ~ ': ~ c p . ~ 6, ~ \tau i ̀ v ~ \mu a ́ \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu ~ a i r \eta ิ s . ~$
 from 12: cp. I34I b 9, tijs є́pyarias. Does Aristotle refer to the same kind of performances which Plato rejects in Laws Si2 D sq.?
 of Anaxilas（Athen．Deipn． 623 e，f：Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr．3．3522），
 ảєí T८ кaıvòv kaт＇évıautò̀ Onpióv тіктє，
where Anaxilas has perhaps before him Plato，Laws 660 B ，кazvà
 छ̀umaбaע к．т．入．These feats of execution in singing and playing are distinguished here from ordinary＇agonistic＇performances； the nature of＇agonistic＇music may be divined from Probl．19． 15. 918 b 20 sqq．and Pol．5（8）．7． 1342 a 22 sqq．Does Aristotle refer to the musical innovations of Timotheus among others，as to which see Pherecr．Xeipoy Fragm．I（Meineke，Fr．Com．Gr． 2. 326 sqq．）？Cp．also Plato，Laws 812 D－E．
 we have mentioned＇（i．e．music that is neither agonistic nor of extraordinary difficulty）＇only to the point at which＇etc．For this limitation cp：Plato，Laws 8 I $2 \mathrm{~B}-\mathrm{E}$ ．
 cp ．Plato，Polit． 268 B，where Plato refers to the effect of music on herds and flocks，and Rep． 620 A，where he speaks of＇swans and other musical animals．＇Cp．also Pindar，Fragm．220，and Athen． Deipn． 328 f ．For the conjunction of $\zeta \varphi \hat{\varphi} a$ and $\pi a \iota \delta i \alpha$, cp．Rhet．I．
 Eud．2．8． 1224 a 29 and 7．2． 1236 a 2，and Plato，Theaet． 17 I E，


 not be instruments which serve for festival－competitions or in wonderful feats of execution（ro sqq．）．

18．оüтє $\gamma$ à $\rho$ aủ入oùs к．т．入．Tє $\chi \nu$ เкà ö ópava are instruments designed for use at festival－competitions（ 34 I b 10 ）．It is implied here that learning to play on them would tend to make boys ill recipients of musical and other training．Why is this？Probably because learning to play on them trained the hand rather than the mind （ 34 I b r， 6 sqq．）．The cithara must have come by Aristotle＇s time to differ a good deal from the lyre ；still Plato retains（Rep． 399 D）both lyre and cithara．A $\dot{\tau} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu, 20$ ，i．e．$\tau \omega ิ \nu$ óp $\gamma a ́ v \omega \nu$.
 use of the aủdós in education．It is not an instrument expressive of
ethical character（see above on 1340 a 36），but rather one for employment in orgiastic rites（compare the use of the word $\beta$ акхєia in c．7． 1342 b 4 in connexion with ópyta⿱亠тıк̀̀ каì $\pi a \theta \eta \tau \iota \kappa$ áa），one which produces that modification of emotion which orgiastic rites produce．For $\pi a \nexists \eta \tau \iota \kappa o ́ \nu$ is a wider term than òpyıaorıкóv：not all things that are $\pi a \theta \eta \tau \iota \kappa a ́$ are ópyıaotıкá．The use of the aủдós in the worship of Dionysus（Virg．Aen．11．737，ubi curva choros indixit tibia Bacchi）and of Cybele（Hor．Carm．4．1．22，Berecyntiae tibiae）is well known．Cp．also Strabo，pp．466，468，and Plato， Crito 54 D．＇One who listens to the remarkable music of the flute and cymbals at the dances of dervishes in Konia or Kara Hissar of Phrygia can understand the intoxicating influence which it had over the devotees and populace of antiquity＇（Prof．W．M． Ramsay in Journal of Hellenic Studies，8．510）．Some light is thrown on the effect of the aủ入ós in orgiastic worship by Plut．


 1342 a 8 sqq．and see note on this passage．Compare also Plut． Pelopid．c． 19 （quoted above on 1274 a 32 ），where however the aủ ${ }^{\prime}$ ós is regarded，not as a means of stirring，and so carrying off， emotion，but as a means of softening the untempered strength of the spirited element in the Theban character．

22．ต̈бte $\pi$ गòs toùs toloútous к．т．入．For toùs toloútovs kalpoùs èv ois $k . \tau . \lambda$ ．see note on 1337 b 6．Bonitz（Ind． 329 a 43）appears to give $\dot{\eta} \theta \epsilon \omega \rho i a$ here the sense of＇spectaculum，＇to judge by the passages with which he groups the passage before us，as do also Sepulveda and some others，but it probably means much the same thing as $\dot{\eta}$ äkpóaəıs（Sus．${ }^{3}$ Ind．s．v．）；we must，however，remember that av̀ $\eta \sigma$ ss was accompanied with certain bodily movements on the part of the performer（ 134 I b 18 ），so that there was something to be seen as well as heard．For the contrast between kádaposs and $\mu a ́ \theta \eta \sigma \iota s$ here compare the contrast between $\pi a \theta \epsilon i \nu \quad$ and $\mu a \theta \epsilon i \nu$ in Aristot．Fragm． 15 in Rose＇s second edition of the Fragments


 persons of mature age from listening to music（and it is persons of mature age，not boys，that Aristotle has in view here）appears from c． 5 ． 1339 a 34 sqq．
24. $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \theta \omega \hat{\mu} \in \nu \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т.t. In interfering with the use of language the use of the aù入ós interferes with a means of education, for the air and the words sung exercise an educating influence on the singer. Cp. also De Part. An. 2. 16.659 b 30, oi $\delta^{\prime}$ äv $\ell \rho \omega \pi о$ надакà каì




 кaì $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \epsilon ่ \lambda \in v \theta \epsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \nu$ is a rugged expression, and I have not happened to meet with any parallel to it. There is less ruggedness in the language of Plutarch in Reip. Gerend. Praec. c. 30, |  |
| :---: |
| $\sigma$ |$\epsilon \rho$ oivy ó

 Фрíyıò к.т.入.
 a very early date who were also performers on the à̉ósMirnnermus of Colophon and Smyrna at the end of the seventh century b.c. (Strabo, p. 643) and Sacadas of Argos at the beginning of the sixth (Plut. De Musica, c. 9). Compare Athen. Deipn.



 $\nu \epsilon \sigma \tau a ́ t o v s, ~ K a \lambda \lambda i a \nu ~ \tau \epsilon ~ т o ̀ \nu ~ ' I \pi \pi o v i ́ k o v ~ к а i ̀ ~ K \rho \iota \tau i a \nu ~ r o ̀ v ~ К а \lambda \lambda a i ́ \sigma \chi \rho o v . ~$ Athenaeus shows by quotations from the $\Delta a u \tau a \lambda \epsilon i s$ of Aristophanes (Fragm. 17: Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 1037) and from the Ephialtes of Phrynichus (Fragm. 3: Meineke 2. 58x), that the aủdós was commonly taught to boys in the days when these plays were performed. A reaction set in at Athens against the study of the aùós, aided perhaps by the increased hostility to Thebes which must have resulted from the Athenian defeat at Delium (в.c. $4^{24}$ ), and certainly by the influence of Alcibiades (vol. i. p. 365 , note 3 ), but Archytas at Tarentum, among other Pythagoreans, and Epaminondas at Thebes are said to have played on the aidós (Athen. Deipn. 184e: see above on 1340 b 35), and we have already seen that at the Pontic Heracleia, a city in the population of which a Boeotian element was included (Paus. 5. 26. 7), the custom of learning to play on it still prevailed in the time of Chamaeleon (a little later than Aristotle), so that when Aristotle speaks of the study of the aùdós as 'rejected,' we may take him to refer to the general rule.
 of the Hellenes of Greece Proper, for they alone took part in the repulse of the Persian invasion in B.C. 480 and 479 , and it is of this that the expression rà M M $\bar{d}$ cká is commonly used (Busolt, Gr. Gesch., ed. 2, 2. 614 . 1). When Aristotle looks back to an increase of wealth and leisure and a consequent widening of study at a date even prior to the invasion of Xerxes, he may be referring to the time of Anacharsis and to the story about him which Herodotus


 the repulse of Xerxes the Greeks of Greece Proper threw themselves with vigour into the study of painting sculpture and architecture ; the dramatic art made a great advance, and many States began for the first time to strike coins. Cp. Diod. 12. I. 4. A similar spirit shows itself, though less happily, in the determination of Themistocles and Thucydides, son of Melesias, that their sons should be made marvellous horsemen and wrestlers (Plato, Meno 93-94). Compare with Aristotle's picture of Greece after the Persian Wars what we read of the intellectual and artistic progress of the United Provinces after the War of Independence. M. Lefêvre-Pontalis remarks in his Life of John de Witt (Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 12) that 'prosperity and freedom combined had been for the United Provinces the signal for a sudden blossoming of arts, sciences, and letters,' and illustrates his remark by enumerating the painters, jurists, philosophers, scholars, soldiers, and men of science who flourished in the United Provinces at this epoch. That leisure was thought to be favourable to high aims we see from c. 2. 1337 b I4 sq. and 7 (5). 11. 13 13 b is sq.
 between things, but seeking out fresh studies.' Cp. Hdt. 3. 39,






 that an aulêtês was allotted to the chorêgus to accompany the chorus, the aulêtês being commonly a man of inferior social
position (cp. Athen. Deipn. 624 b , סıò kaì toùs $\pi a \rho a ̀ ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~ " E \lambda \lambda \eta \sigma ı \nu ~$

 кà̀ Báßus), while the chorêgus was a man of wealth and rank, but in this instance the chorêgus himself acted as aulêtês. We learn from this passage that chorêgi existed in the Lacedaemonian State ; their existence at Athens is a familiar fact, and they can be shown to have existed in other States also (see Gilbert, Gr. Staatsalt. 2. 372 . r). As Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ( r .603 ) points out, the chorus at Lacedaemon here mentioned was probably not a dramatic but a lyrical chorus.

 are contrasted with $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau$ es in I34I b i3 sq., and with Bávavoor and $\theta \hat{\eta} \tau e s$ in c. 7.1342 a 18 sqq., where $\epsilon^{\prime} \lambda e^{\prime} \dot{\theta} \theta \rho 0$ os is conjoined with $\pi \in \pi a \iota \partial \in \nu \mu$ évos.
35. $\delta \hat{\eta} \lambda$ गov $\delta$ è к.. . . Chorêgi sometimes dedicated to Dionysus a tablet recording the victory of the poet whose play they had brought out: so we read of Themistocles in Plut. Themist. c. 5,


 A. Müller, Die griech. Bühnenalterth., p. 418 , who follows Bergk in

 aưoô tò òvoцa к.т..入. The tablet mentioned by Aristotle here cannot of course have shown that most Athenians of respectability were able to play on the cidós: it can only have recorded the name of one such Athenian as having acted as aulêtês on this particular occasion. As to Ecphantides, one of the earliest comic poets at Athens, see Sus. ${ }^{4}$, and Meineke, Hist. Crit. Com. Gr. p. 35 sqq.
 wards it was rejected [as an instrument for the young and for gentlefolks] simply by force of experience.'
 not only the aù入ós, but also the five instruments mentioned here, together with others which, like them, required manual dexterity and skill, were used by the young and by gentlefolks, but that they were afterwards discarded, so far as these classes were concerned, because they were thought not to contribute to virtue. They were probably regarded as training the hand rather than the mind or
character, and of three of them-sambucae and triangular and septangular harps-we read that their strength lay in pleasing the ear of the listener, not in anything ennobling. Music, however, that is merely for pleasure is said to be no better than a 'plaything' by Plato (Polit. 288 C : cp. Gorg. 50 E E and Laws 700 D sqq.); the best type of music leads on to the love of тò ка入óv (Rep. 403 C). As to the instruments here named see Sus. ${ }^{4}$, I. p. 632 sqq., and Blümner, Home Life of the Ancient Greeks, Eng. Trans., pp. 312-314. The sambuca was high-pitched and piercing in tone (Aristid. Quint. De Mus. p. ror, चì̀ $\delta \dot{\epsilon} \sigma a \mu ß u ́ k \eta \nu$

 Deipn. 633 f ), whereas the lyre was deeper in tone (Aristid. Quint. ibid). Trigona and pectides (which were a kind of harp) had already been rejected by Plato in Rep. 399 C as being 'manystringed and many-toned,' but the number of strings in the pectis seems to have varied (Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. p. 632 Sq.), and Aristotle does not name this ground for rejecting them. Opinion at Mytilene was probably favourable to the sambuca, for we read in Euphorion ap. Athen. Deipn. 182 f of a statue of one of the Muses there, who was represented holding a sambuca.
 695 sqq.: Hygin. Fab. 165 (quoted in Bull. de Corr. Hellénique 12. 107): Paus. 1. 24. I: Aristid. Quint. De Mus. p. 109. As Schneider points out, Aristotle evidently has before him the lines of Melanippides (Fragm. 2 Bergk) and the reply of Telestes (Fragm. I Bergk): see for both Athen. Deipn. 616 sq. Some, however, ascribed the invention of the aùdós to Apollo (Plut. De
 one were commonly used for playing in Greece.
 Athena had said, when casting away the aùdoí, ${ }_{\epsilon} \rho \rho \epsilon \tau^{\prime}$ aï $\sigma \chi \epsilon a, \sigma \dot{\mu} \mu a \tau \iota ~ \lambda \hat{v} \mu a$,

Є. oủ $\mu \grave{\eta} \nu$ ả $\lambda \lambda \grave{\alpha}$ к.т. $\lambda$. Aristotle probably remembers an old saying (Athen. Deipn. 337 e),


Cp. Aristid. Quint. De Mus. p. rog, àmoppíqaı tìv Éóv фarı toùs





 'training in flute-playing contributes in no way to the intelligence,' cp. Chrysipp. ap. Plut. De Stoicorum Repugnantiis, c. 14, $\pi \rho \omega \hat{\omega}$ ov



 and 'skill in art' are mentioned together, just as we have in Plato,


 us кaì $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \in \in \chi \nu \eta \nu$ is probably added in explanation and limitation of $\tau \dot{\eta} \nu \bar{\epsilon} \pi \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\eta} \mu \eta \nu$, for it is the less wide term of the two: cp. De Soph.
 cp. Hom. Odyss. 13. 297 ,



where she is the speaker: II. 5.60 sq., 9.390 , and $\mathrm{I}_{5} .4$ II sq. : Plato, Polit. ${ }_{74}$ C (cp. Plut. De Fortuna, c. 4): and Paus. 8. 36. 5,

 goreans in Syncell. Chron. p. 149 C (quoted by Zeller, Gr. Ph. i.
 $\Delta i a, ~ \tau \eta ̀ \nu ~ \delta e ̀ ~ ' A \theta \eta \nu a ̂ \nu ~ \tau e ́ \chi \nu \eta \nu . ~$
8. $\boldsymbol{\epsilon} \pi \in \mathfrak{i} \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ к.т. $\mathrm{\lambda}$. The apodosis to this protasis virtually comes
 reaches these words he has forgotten the existence of his protasis, owing to the interposition of the long parenthesis (10-18) in which he states his reasons for excluding a professional study of music. Compare I. I2. 1259 a 37 sqq., where the same thing occurs.
 because the word $\tau$ exurkós was commonly used in a different sense.
 aim is pleasure (Gorg. 501 E), and Aristotle here has before him the whole passage, Gorg. $501 \mathrm{~B}-502 \mathrm{~A}$.
 introduces the reason why Aristotle rejects study with a view to festival-competitions, not the reason why he calls this study $\tau \epsilon \chi \nu \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ : hence the parenthesis which Sus. begins before $\tau \in \chi \nu \iota \kappa \eta \nu$ should
 should study is his own improvement in virtue (c. 2. 1337 b 17 sqq.). The $\epsilon \lambda \in \dot{v} \theta \epsilon \rho$ os is defined in Metaph. A. 2.982 b 25 sqq. as ó aúzồ
 convenience of another (Rhet. 1. 9. 1367 a 31 sq.). To do things with a view to the virtue of others would be more befitting to him than to contribute merely to their pleasure (cp. Plato, Gorg. 500 A sq.). Thus aivoô and ajpē̄ŋs are both of them emphatic, and also $\tau \omega ิ \nu a \dot{\alpha} \kappa o v o ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$ and $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ í $\delta o \nu \eta ̂ s$.
14. For каi. . . $\delta \dot{\eta}$ see note on 1253 a 18 . We expect ßávavqov rather than ßavav́govs, but see note on 1338 b 1 .
 evil with a view to which they select their end ' (cp. c. 5. I 339 b 3 I,
 I391 b i6, 手 тò̀ $\theta \epsilon \omega \rho o ̀ \nu$ ó $\lambda o ́ \gamma o s ~ \sigma v \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon \nu)$. Competitors at a festival play, or sing and play, in the way which is most likely to please the less refined among their audience.
 Hotoús rıvas, i.e. $\beta$ avav́rovs. As to the кıvíбєเs of performers on the







 тòv Өŋßaîov (cp. Scholiast. Aeschin. quoted by Meineke, Hist. Crit.

 (Про́voдos) тà Ááapa. Pronomus was a famous player on the av̉入ós. In a bas-relief found at Mantineia (see Bull. de Corr. Hell. 12. 105 sqq., esp. p. 110 sq.) the contorted attitude of Marsyas, as he plays on the aùdós in competition with the cithara of Apollo, is in strong contrast with the calm bearing of the god.

19．£кєттє́ov $\delta^{\prime}$ ëtı к．т．入．Aristotle has finished what he had to C．7． say about đ̈p $\quad$ ava and＇́pyaria，and now only one of the subjects mentioned in c． 6 ．I 340 b 41 sqq．remains to be dealt with，and
 $\pi a \iota \delta \epsilon v o \mu \in ́ v o \iota s ~ \pi о \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\nu})$ ．But in taking up this subject for considera－ tion Aristotle gives a wider extension to it than he had led us to expect that he would，and announces that he will inquire generally
 use in education．And in fact we find in the sequel that he inquires in this chapter not only what harmonies are to be used in education，but also what are to be used for the other purposes served by music．This is quite in accordance with c．5．1339 a II sqq．，where the question proposed for discussion is the broad question，for how many purposes music is useful．We see，there－ fore，that the Fifth Book of the Politics is not exclusively concerned with questions relating to the education of youth，but occupies itself also with the question for what purposes music is to be used in adult life．As to the state of the text in 19－26 see critical note．

21．тoîs mpòs matסєiav סıamovoûol，＇those who are practising music with a view to education＇：cp．Tà touûta ס८amoveiv，c．5．1339 a


 Sepulv．＇musicam in cantus modulatione et rythmis consistere，＇and so most interpreters，but Vict．explains，＇musicam exerceri colique et per cantus et per numeros，＇and perhaps he is right．Cp．4（7）．


24．тои́тшу $\delta^{\prime}$ є́ка́тєрог к．т．入．What the difference is between the educational effect of rhythm and melody，Aristotle does not tell us， for the promise here given of a discussion of the subject is not fulfilled in what we possess of the Politics．We see from Plato，
 them єúáp $\mu o \sigma \tau o$, ，but Aristotle probably has in view some more tangible difference than this．The $\epsilon \ddot{v} \rho v \theta \mu$ os $\mu \circ v \sigma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta}$ would be the better preparation for war（cp．Polyb．4．20．6）．But the key to the question which of the two kinds is the better for education will be found in the question which benefits the character most．

27．vo $\mu$ ívavtєs oûv к．т．入．Cp．I 342 a $3^{\text {I }}$ sq．Specialists in music （ $\mu$ оvбıкоí，ср． 1342 b 23 ，$\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \mu о v \sigma \iota \kappa \eta \dot{\nu} \tau \tau \nu \epsilon s$ ）are distinguished here from philosophers who have received a musical training
 see below on 1342 a 3 r，and cp．for $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa$ Aeschin．c．Ctes．c．${ }^{2} 22$ ）． Works seem to have been in existence written by men belonging to each of these classes，which went into full detail both on the subject of harmonies and rhythms and on that of musical educa－ tion．As to the persons referred to see note on 1340 b 5 ．

31．As to the meaning of $v o \mu \mu \kappa \omega \hat{s}$ see Sus．${ }^{4}$ ，who renders the word＇formally，＇and compares Metaph．M．i．1о76 a 27 ，$\dot{a} \pi \lambda \bar{\omega} s$ кaì örov vópov $\chi$ áplv．But does not the word mean＇after the fashion of a law，＇i．e．in a broad and general way，as a law does？Cp．3． 15 ．


 סıка⿱㇒⿻二亅⿱八乂，
 on the familiar distinction of $\bar{\eta} \theta \eta \pi \rho a \dot{\xi} \epsilon \epsilon s$ and $\pi \dot{d} \theta_{\eta}$（cp．Poet． 1 ．
 the four kinds of tragedy mentioned in Poet．18． $1455^{\mathrm{b}} 3^{2}$ sqq．one is $\dot{\eta} \dot{\eta} \theta \kappa \kappa \dot{\eta}$ and another $\dot{\eta} \pi a \theta \eta \tau \kappa \kappa \dot{\eta}$ ．Compare also Strabo，p． 15 ，


 virtue（see above on 1340 a ${ }^{6} 6$ ）；as to $\pi \rho a к \tau \kappa \kappa \grave{\alpha} ~ \mu ' є \lambda \eta$ ，＇melodies which





 Практкка̀ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \lambda \eta$ seem to have been the favourites at Sparta ：cp．Plut．


 gives a somewhat different account of Spartan songs in Lycurg．


 кал $\bar{\nu} \nu$ ．As to $\pi \rho a к т \tau \kappa a ̀ ~ \mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ ，which were of course not exclusively warlike，see vol．i．p． 367 ，note I．Dr．Johnson describes in his Journey to the Western Islands（Works，8．279）how the strokes of
the reapers' sickles 'were timed by the modulation of the harvestsong, in which all their voices were united,' and adds that 'they accompany in the Highlands every action which can be done in equal time with an appropriated strain, which has, they say, not much meaning, but its effects are regularity and cheerfulness. The ancient proceleusmatic song, by which the rowers of galleys were animated, may be supposed to have been of this kind.'
33. $\dot{\omega}$ s is followed in 35 by kai. For instances of a similar structure see note on $13{ }^{1} 3 \mathrm{~b} \mathrm{I}_{3}$.
35. каi тติv ápuovīิv к.т...,, 'and they lay down that musical modes are appropriate in nature to each of these, one mode answering to one kind of melody and another to another.' The Dorian mode was the appropriate harmony for $\dot{\eta} \theta \iota k \grave{\alpha} \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \eta$, the Phrygian for èv $\nu$ Oovatactıcá, and perhaps the hypo-Phrygian (see above on $3^{2}$ ) for тракткка́. Mépos seems here to be used in the sense of ciios ( $\mathrm{cp} . \delta \iota a i \rho \epsilon \sigma \tau, 3^{2}$ ): for this use of the word see Bon. Ind. 455 b 46 sqq.
36. фaцèv $\delta$ ¢̀ к.т.入. Cp. c. 5. 1339 b 14. Plato, on the other hand, had spoken in Laws 659 D-660 A as if the ethical use of music was its only use. For кaì $\pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ úval see note on 1287 a 34.
 1342 a 8 . The promise here given of a full explanation of the word ká日apots is not fulfilled in the Poetics as it has come down to us : see note in Sus. ${ }^{4}$. For other matters known to have found a place in Aristotle's treatise which are wanting in our Poetics, see Zeller, Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 107. I (Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. i. p. 102. 2). 'We possess Aristotle's treatise,' he remarks, ' only in a text mutilated and in many ways corrupted.' For $\dot{a} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} s$, 'in a general way,' cp. Magn. Mor. I. 4.
 ठıорі́वаи $\delta \epsilon i$.
40. трírov $\delta e ̀$ mpòs $\delta \iota a \gamma \omega \gamma \eta \dot{\nu}$ к.т.ג. Bernays translates in his Grundzüge der verlorenen Abhandlung des Aristoteles über Wirkung der Tragödie, p. 7 (ed. 1880), 'drittens zur Ergötzung, um sich zu erholen und abzuspannen,' but if, as he seems to think,

 in a different sense from that in which it is used elsewhere in the Fifth Book, e.g. in c. 5. 1339 b 14, where it is distinguished from $\pi a u \delta c^{\prime}$. This is not perhaps impossible, but it is more likely that

VOL. III.
$\delta$ oay $\omega$ y' is used here in the same sense as in 1339 b 14, and that it
 already been so linked in c. 5.1339 b 15 sqq. Zeller, indeed, thinks (Gr. Ph. 2. 2. 77 I. r : Aristotle and the Earlier Peripatetics, Eng. Trans., vol. ii. p. 308. r) that Aristotle intends ävéts and $\tau \hat{\eta} s$ coveovias àvátavoıs to come in as a fourth end and not as a part of the third, though the word tétaptov is not used. Sus. would read
 àváaavotv partly for other reasons and partly because he regards it as inconceivable 'that the cathartic enjoyment could possibly be anything else but either that of pure amusement and sensuous delight or the genuine higher aesthetic enjoyment which is a part of the highest intellectual culture and rational satisfaction' (see Sus. ${ }^{4}$, x. p. 638 sqq.), but if any change in the text is necessary, I should be content with the insertion of $\eta$ 放 before $\pi \rho o ̀ s a ̈ \nu \in \sigma v$.
 трóтov đáбaıs Xp $\eta \sigma \tau$ éov. Aristotle probably refers only to the modes which are not $\pi a \rho \epsilon \kappa \beta \dot{a} \sigma \epsilon \epsilon$, yet he finds a use in 22 sqq. even
 1283 а 30.
 of $\dot{\eta} \theta$ tкштátaus here and $\dot{\eta} \theta$ tкois in 28 see note on 1340 a 36. Aristotle may use the plural because he is prepared to approve, in addition to the Dorian mode, of the $\dot{i \pi v o \delta} \omega \rho \iota \sigma \tau i$, of which we read in Probl.
 is more likely that he does not wish to exclude any modes

 He rejects without consideration the possible claims of $\pi \rho a k \tau \iota \alpha \dot{a}$ and èv $\begin{gathered}\text { ovoractikà } \\ \mu \hat{\epsilon} \lambda \eta \text { to a place, however subordinate, in the }\end{gathered}$ education of the young, but he might well have considered whether they do not deserve to be occasionally used. Are not boys, or
 music be sometimes useful to such boys even educationally? Might not airs which stir to action also be a useful element in the education of some boys? It is not clear that Aristotle objects to the presence of boys at the performance of $\pi \rho a к т \iota \kappa \grave{~ k a i ~ e ̀ v \theta o v \sigma u a \sigma t ı к \grave{~}}$ $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$, any more than he objects to their presence at the performance of tragedies (cp. 4 (7). 17. 1336 b 20 sqq.), but he certainly allows no place in education to music of these two kinds.
 right in translating these words 'also the practical and the enthu-


ô $\gamma \dot{d} \rho$ к.т. $\lambda$. See note in Sus. ${ }^{4}$. Aristotle seems to anticipate that his recommendation of the use of the 'enthusiastic' modes, when we listen to music played by others, will excite surprise, and hence in $4-16$ he justifies it at some length, though he adds no similar justification of his recommendation of the use of the 'practical' modes under similar circumstances, probably because he does not anticipate that any objection will be made to this.




 appropriate technical term, cp. Plato, Symp. 215 C, and Aristid.


 a striking example in Olympias, the mother of Alexander (Plut.
 $\dot{\epsilon} \nu \theta_{0} v \sigma \tau a \sigma \mu \circ \dot{\jmath}$ к. $\tau . \lambda_{0}$ ). Had Aristotle observed in her case the calming effect of sacred melodies?
 dies we see these men, when they have used the melodies which fill the soul with mystic excitement, brought back to a normal state as if having received medical treatment and purgation.' Sus. ${ }^{4}$ points out
 term. It seems likely that the patient both listened to and sang
 $\psi v \chi \grave{\eta} \nu \mu \epsilon \lambda_{\epsilon \sigma t}$ has been interpreted in many ways. Vict. explains these words 'cantibus expiando animo frangendisque vehementioribus illis motibus aptis,' Lamb. 'cantibus animum furore levantibus ac purgantibus,' and Liddell and Scott 'melodies which purge by mystic rites,' but Sepulveda is probably right in translating 'cantibus animum concitantibus' (cp. 1342 b 3 , ä $\mu \phi \omega$ үàp ó $\rho \gamma \iota a \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \alpha ̀ ~ к a i ̀ ~$ $\pi a \nexists \eta \tau \kappa \kappa$ í). Bernays (followed by Sus.) renders the words in a not very dissimilar way, 'Lieder die eben das Gemüth berauschen' ('songs which intoxicate the soul'). "Oтav- $\mu \in \lambda \in \sigma \iota$ is bracketed by
 perhaps not all the iepà $\mu \epsilon \lambda \eta$ were 'intoxicating to the soul': cp.


 There may have been if $\rho \grave{a} \mu \mu^{\prime} \dot{\lambda} \eta$ introductory to the melody which produced the decisive effect. T $\grave{\eta} \psi v \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ is emphatic: if the music does not go to the soul, it does nothing. For katıorapévous see above on 1340 b 3. In iarpeias кai каAípo $\epsilon \omega s$ the каi is explanatory,
 1257 b 7). The action of the sacred melodies on the souls of persons naturally disposed to èvoovocarpós is compared to the action of some cathartic medicine like hellebore, which removes the worst


 following passages may be selected from many others as throwing light on Aristotle's meaning-Plut. Sympos. 6. 7. 2, кaì đà ${ }^{\text {ä }} \boldsymbol{\nu} \theta \rho \omega-$












 duced a similar effect on the soul to that produced by cathartic medicines on the body, we see from Plato, Rep. 560 D, toúrov 0 é $\gamma$ '




 the purging influence of the rites is traced in part to the music by which they were accompanied. On the whole subject of the

кá̈apois effected by music and also by tragedy, see Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. p. 64 I sqq., and Prof. Butcher, Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, c. 6. We are not distinctly told in the passage before us that a kíधapous $\pi a \theta \eta \mu \dot{\text { a }} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ occurs under the influence of the sacred melodies, as we are in the famous passage of the Poetics about tragedy (Poet. 6. 1449 b 27 sq.), but we can hardly be wrong in taking the musical
 noticed that music appears to purge all emotions, not merely, like tragedy, those of pity and fear, and also that the kind of music which produces a cathartic effect is by no means the wailful kind characteristic of such modes as the mixo-Lydian; music of this sort is charged with human feeling and essentially human, whereas cathartic music is full of a divine aflatus (Probl. 19.48. 922 b 19 ,


 the 'Dorian mood' is said to inspire 'deliberate valour' ' firm and unmoved With dread of death to flight or foul retreat ' (cp. 1342 b 12 sqq.), and is also credited with a cathartic influence which Aristotle does not ascribe to it-
'Nor wanting power to mitigate and swage
With solemn touches troubled thoughts, and chase
Anguish and doubt and fear and sorrow and pain From mortal or immortal minds.'
Here the passage before us may be present to Milton's mind. Julian perhaps refers to it in Epist. 56. 442 B, örı yà $\pi \rho o ̀ ̀ ~ \tilde{j} \mu \hat{\omega} \nu$ aủroì


11. тaủrò $\delta$ ŋ̀̀ тoûto к.т.ג. Aristotle seems still to be speaking of the effect of the sacred melodies. They cannot fail, he thinks, to purge others besides those who are specially given to $\mathfrak{\epsilon v} \boldsymbol{v}$ ovaracuósthose who are specially subject to the emotions of fear and pity (two allied emotions, as we learn from Rhet. 2. 8), and indeed those who are subject to emotion of any kind, and also those who are not specially emotional, so far as they are accessible to emotion. Philoxenus had represented the Cyclops as 'curing his love with music' (Philox. Fragm. 7 : Plut. Amat. c. 18), and anger also was thought to be soothed by music (Athen. Deipn. 623 f sq.). As to the specially emotional persons referred to,





 the things mentioned' (i.e. emotions) 'falls to each': cp. 3. 6.

 $\mu \epsilon \tau а \lambda а \mu ß a ́ v \epsilon \iota \nu ~ \epsilon \dot{\delta} \delta a \iota \mu \nu \nu i ́ a s$.
14. тıva ќ́日apoır. Bern.' irgend eine Katharsis,' and Prof. Butcher (Aristotle's Theory of Poetry and Fine Art, ed. 2, p. 246, note 1) observes, ' $\tau \iota \nu a ̀ ~ k a ́ \theta u \rho \sigma \iota \nu$ implies that the katharsis in all cases is not precisely of the same kind,' and (p. 247) 'it is pretty plainly implied that the katharsis of pity and fear in tragedy is analogous to, but not identical with, the katharsis of "enthusiasm." This may be so, but I am not sure that Aristotle means anything more than that all experience some purgation, though the amount of it varies with the amount of emotion by which they are severally possessed : cp. Plut. De Tranq. An. c. 9 , $\delta \in i ̂ ~ \delta \grave{\epsilon}$ кaì $\tau \grave{a}$ koıvà ('things which are shared by men in general ') $\mu \grave{\eta} \pi a \rho o \rho a ̂ v, ~ a ̉ \lambda \lambda \lambda^{\prime}{ }^{\epsilon} \nu \tau \tau \nu \iota \lambda o ́ \gamma \varphi \tau i \theta \epsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$. Tıs, indeed, is sometimes added to a substantive merely to soften it, as in Xen.

 I do not think that this is the case here.
 (quoted above on 8): De Gen. An. 1. 18. 725 b 8, ỏ入íyous $\delta \epsilon ́ \tau \tau \tau \iota \nu$ év

 $\sigma \omega ́ \mu a \tau^{\prime} \epsilon \dot{\jmath} \eta \mu \epsilon \rho \epsilon i ̂ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda о \nu:$ and Hist. An. 10. $5 \cdot 636$ b 29 sqq.
15. ó ooíws $\delta \grave{e}$ к.т. $\lambda$., 'and similarly the cathartic melodies also' (as well as the sacred melodies) 'are a source to men of harmless pleasure.' So Vict. 'ut cantilenas illas sacras, quas docuit adhiberi solitas sua aetate ad expiandos lymphaticos, praeter furorem quem levant affirmavit gignere voluptatem, ita nunc testatur cantus purgandis animis factos, qui tamen non opitulantur ope divina valde commotis animo, sed concentu vocum sonorumque, apto illis motibus, prosunt, continere in se suavitatis plurimum.' The fact that they are a source of harmless pleasure shows that they are well suited both for diagogê and for relaxation (cp. c. 5. 1339b 25 sqq.). The cathartic melodies here referred to seem to be the
same as those which are called enthusiastic in 1341 b 34 . I understood this passage otherwise when I wrote (in vol. i. p. 366), 'the melodies also which purge emotion are similarly productive of innocent pleasure.' I should have written, 'just as the sacred melodies produce this effect, so the melodies which purge emotion are similarly productive of innocent pleasure.' [Since the foregoing note was written, Sus. ${ }^{4}$ (r. p. 6ri) has rightly disagreed with the view which I took of the sentence in vol. i. p. 366. I then thought that it referred to cathartic melodies as distinguished from cathartic harmonies, whereas I think now that it refers to cathartic melodies as distinguished from the sacred melodies, whose effects I take to be described in $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \delta^{\prime} i \epsilon \rho \hat{\omega} \nu \mu \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu, 8-\dot{\eta} \delta \nu \nu \hat{\eta} s, ~ I 5 . ~ I ~ a m ~$ still of opinion that кa $\theta$ aptıкí should be retained in $)_{5}$, and not, as Sus. suggests, discarded in favour of $\pi \rho а к т т к \dot{c}$.
16. $\delta$ เò к.т. $\lambda$. Mév is taken up, not by $\delta^{\prime}$ in 19 , but by $\delta \dot{e ́ ~ i n ~} 28$. Wiih Spengel and Sus. I insert ( $\chi \rho \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota$ ) before $\theta \epsilon \tau \epsilon \in \rho v: ~ c p . ~ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon ́ o \nu$,





 $\sigma \cup \gamma к \in \dot{\prime} \mu \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} 0$ s. Sus. ${ }^{4}$ aptly compares Cic. De Fin. 2. 14. 44, cum Epicuro autem hoc plus est negotii, quod e duplici genere voluptatis coniunctus est.
21. àүต̂vas кai $\theta \epsilon \omega$ pías, 'contests and spectacles.' Cp. 8 (6). 8.

 appears that a 'contest' was a kind of 'spectacle.' A dramatic or musical performance would also be a 'spectacle.' Өєшpia is explained by Stallbaum to be used in the wider sense of 'festival' ' $\varepsilon^{\circ} \rho \tau \boldsymbol{\eta}$ ') in Plato, Laws $650 \mathrm{~A}, \tau \bar{\eta} s ~ r o v ̂ ~ \Delta ı o v v ́ \sigma o v ~ \theta e \omega p i a s . ~ C p . ~ a l s o ~ I s o c r . ~ A e g i n e t . ~$
 the use of kai in kai roîs rooov́rots that Aristotle is prepared to pro-
 for the citizens of his 'best State.' It is remarkable that he should expect day-labourers to care for music of any kind.
22. єioi $\delta^{3}$ ต̈̈ $\sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ aütêv ai $\psi u \times a i$ к.т..ג. As to the souls of Bivavorot and $\theta$ ๆ̂res cp. Plato, Rep. 495 D, quoted above on 1337 b 8. The position of eioi is strange ; it seems hardly to belong to
 к.т...., for that clause is already provided with an cioi. Did Aristotle
 and insert $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ к.т.. . by an afterthought? Perhaps the repetition of $\epsilon i \sigma i$ in 24 is to be compared with the repetition of $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o \nu$ in 3.13 .

 between the soul and an áprovia dwelt on in c. 5.1340 b 17 sqq.
 $\lambda v \delta \iota \sigma \tau i($ Plato, Rep. 398 E ) are probably among the modes referred to, and perhaps also the low-pitched Lydian and low-pitched Ionian (see note in Sus. ${ }^{4}$ ); at any rate both high-pitched and lowpitched modes are treated as $\pi a \rho \epsilon \kappa \beta$ á $\sigma \epsilon t s{ }_{\tau} \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \rho \mu o \nu \omega \hat{\nu} \nu$ in 6 (4). 3 . 1290 a 24 sqq . The abandonment of the mixo-Lydian mode to $\beta$ ávavaot and $\theta \hat{\eta}$ res is uncomplimentary to Sappho, its reputed inventress (see above on 1340 a $4^{2}$ ).
24. каì Tิิ้ $\mu \in \lambda \hat{\omega} \nu \tau \alpha ̀ ~ \sigma u ́ v т о \nu a ~ к а i ̀ ~ \pi а р а к є \chi \rho \omega \sigma \mu \hat{k} v a$, 'and of melodies those which are highly-strung and unnaturally coloured.' ¿úyrova is perhaps used here in opposition both to àvelpéva or $\mu a \lambda a k a ́$, as in $134^{2}$ b 21 and 6 (4).3. 1290a 27 , and to $\beta a \rho \epsilon ́ a$, as in
 $\beta \epsilon \mathrm{e}$ toov. The Cretans are said by Ephorus to have used in their songs the rhythms which are most $\sigma$ iverovoo (Fragm. 64: Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. I. ${ }_{2} 50$ ). For the meaning of $\chi \rho \bar{\omega} \mu a$ in music see Liddell and Scott, s.v., and Sus. ${ }^{4}$, r. p. 636 sqq. Aristotle probably objected to the musical innovations of Timotheus, of whom we read in Pherecr. Xeipov, Fragm. I (Meineke, Fr. Com. Gr. 2. 333),
oṽtos äđauzas ov̂s $\lambda$ '́ $\gamma \omega$


and also to the music of Agathon: cp. Plut. Sympos. 3. I. r,




 also Philoch. Fragm. 66 (Müller, Fr. Hist. Gr. 1. 395), where we

 and Pratinas, Fragm. 5, quoted above on 1340 a 42 .
 women and worthless persons（Rep． 387 E ）．

28．$\omega^{\sigma} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ є $\rho \eta \tau \alpha$ ，in 1342 a 2.

31．oi kow $\omega \nu$ oi к．т．${ }^{\text {．，＇＇those whe whe }}$ study and in musical education，＇as distinguished from mere musicians on the one hand and philosophers who have not studied music on the other（see above on 134［ b 27）．For the phrase cp．Plato，Gorg． 487 C，коєขшขov̀s yєүovótas $\sigma o \not i a s: ~ L a w s ~ 968 ~ A, ~$




32．ó $\delta^{\prime}$ ย̇v тท̂̃ по入ıтєíą $\Sigma \omega к \rho \alpha ́ т \eta s$ к．т．入．Here begins a similar review of the opinions put in Socrates＇mouth by Plato in the Republic to that which we find at the end of the Book on Revolutions（7（5）．12．13ı6 a 1 sqq．）．As to these passages see vol．i．p．519，note 1．The passage in the Republic referred to is Rep． 399 A sqq．，where Plato seems to imply that the Dorian and Phrygian modes inspire courage in war and temperance in peace． Aristotle holds，on the contrary，that the Phrygian mode does neither the one thing nor the other．Фрúrov should probably be




 1291a II，and 7 （5）．I2．1316a 1 ，in all which passages the phrase is used in close proximity to a mention of $\delta \Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \eta s$ ，and $2.5 \cdot$

 （perhaps referring to the Eighth and Ninth Books of the Republic），


34．ảmобокıца́баs，in Rep． 399 D．
2．aủ ${ }^{2}$ os．For the absence of the article see note on 1255 b 36.1342 b ．
3．For the difference between ópyıa⿱宀tıкá and ma0ךтька́ see above on 134I a 2 I ．
 this clear＇（i．e．that the aủ入ós and the Phrygian mode are similar in effect），＇for every sort of Bacchic frenzy and all Bacchic agita－ tion of mind［when represented in poetry］find their fit expression in
the pipes more than in any other instrument.' In translating kivךбוs 'agitation of mind' and not 'bodily movement' I have followed Sus., who may probably be right (cp. 3, $\pi a \neq \eta$ tıká, and c. 3 . 1337 b 42), but I have done so with some hesitation, for ßaкхєia is used of physical movement in Plato, Laws $67_{2} \mathrm{~B}$, tás $\tau \epsilon$


 and cp. c. 6. I 341 a 3, and Plato, Protag. 354 E, 356 D (where see Stallbaum). It should be noted that in a letter (genuine or not) from Olympias to Alexander quoted in Athen. Deipn. 659 f she distinguishes between тà òpqєаттєкà iєpai and тà $\beta a \kappa \chi \iota \kappa a ́$, though in the passage before us $\beta$ акхєia is evidently connected with тò ópyเaбтькóv.
7. vîo ó SıӨúpaцßos к.т.入., 'as for instance the dithyramb, [which is an expression of Bacchic frenzy,] is generally agreed to be a Phrygian melody' (and to require the Phrygian mode).


 quod legitur in media sententia accusandi casu $\mu u ́ \theta o u s . ' ~ S c h n$. 'Reizius latere nomen dithyrambi Philoxenei suspicatus est; et recte quidem. Equidem non dubito Mvaoús id fuisse, quo nomine fabulas tragicas ab Aeschylo et Agathone publico in certamine Athenis commissas fuisse novimus.' Sophocles also wrote a tragedy thus entitled (see Nauck, Trag. Gr. Fragm., p. 175). Schneider's conjecture has been adopted by Coray, Stahr, Bekk. ${ }^{2}$, and Sus., and is probably right, if indeed roùs Muooús is not an explanatory gloss which has crept from the margin into the text. Bergk accepts the change (Poet. Lyr. Gr., Philoxenus Fragm. 20), and adds, 'huc




 dithyramb probably turned, like the tragedies of the same name by Aeschylus and Sophocles, on the story of Telephus. The mention of the title of the dithyramb is made somewhat abruptly, and also without necessity; still the title of a poem by Tyrtaeus is given, though less abruptly, in $7(5) \cdot 7 \cdot 1306 \mathrm{~b} 39$. As to the subjects in connexion with which the Dorian mode was employed, it should
be noticed that，as Plutarch points out（De Musica c．r7），it was sometimes used for трaүıко̀̀ oîkтoь and even for＇̇ $\rho \omega \tau \iota \kappa \alpha ́$, subjects as alien to it，one would have thought，as a dithyramb．We see from Plato，Laws 669 C，that composers were not always successful in mating melody and words．

11．úmò Tท̂s фúซє由s aủTท̂s．Cp．Poet．24． 1460 a 3 sqq．

14．Ётı $\delta \grave{\varepsilon}$ émei к．т．入．Is this a reference to Eth．Nic．2．5． 1106 a 26 sqq．，b 26 sq．？Cp．also Magn．Mor．1．24．1192 a 6，ó äpa


16．фаvєрòv öть тà $\Delta \omega ́ \rho L a ~ \mu e ́ \lambda \eta ~ \pi \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \epsilon \iota ~ \pi a เ \delta \epsilon u ́ \epsilon \sigma \theta a l ~ \mu a ̂ \lambda \lambda o v ~ \tau o i ̂ s ~$ $\nu \in \omega \tau \in ́ \rho o t s . ~ C o r a y ~ a n d ~ S u s . ~ r e a d ~ \tau o v ̀ s ~ \nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon ́ \rho o v s . ~ V e t . ~ I n t . ~ t r a n s l a t e s, ~$ ＇manifestum quod Dorias melodias oportet erudiri magis iuniores，＇ but whether he found roùs $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau \epsilon$ fovs in his Greek text is doubtful． I incline on the whole to retain roîs עє由тє́pots：cp．Eth．Nic． 4.14.


 $\mu a \theta$ eì toîs עéols．
 passage as an interpolation，and I incline now to think that he is right：I thought otherwise when I wrote vol．i．p． 366 ，note 1 ．It would seem that the writer of it seeks to qualify the decision just arrived at in favour of the use of the midway mode in education by pointing out that for certain ages the relaxed modes are the only possible and becoming ones，and also that there is something to be said for the use in education of such modes as the Lydian．It is hardly likely that Aristotle would do this，unless we suppose a change of mind on his part，for he would scarcely be willing to unsay what he has said against the relaxed modes in c． 5.1340 b 2 ， or to allow the boys for whose training he recommends the Dorian mode to be also trained in modes which he regards as soft and effeminate．Besides，as Sus．${ }^{4}$ remarks（i．p．6I6，note），after what has been said in c． 6.1340 b 35 sqq ．we do not expect to hear of old men singing，except perhaps on the occasion of some special festivity（c． 5.1339 b 9 sq ．）．The language of the passage recalls



 and тò $\pi \rho \epsilon ́ \pi \pi o \nu$, or rather tò áp átттov, in the opening chapter of the Book which stands next to the Fifth, if we adopt the order of the Books which has been adopted in the present edition and place the old Fourth Book immediately after the old Eighth. It should further be noticed that Plutarch seems to have had ${ }_{17} 7-29$ before him



 possible that Plutarch had before him the criticism of the Republic by $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \pi \epsilon \rho \grave{\imath} \tau \dot{\eta} \nu \quad \mu \sigma v \sigma \iota \kappa \dot{\eta} \nu \tau \iota \nu \epsilon \epsilon$ which is reproduced here, and not its reproduction in the passage before us. In addition to the objections to the passage $17-34$ to which reference has already been made, it may be noted that, as Sus. has pointed out, looking to the reference to $\tau \dot{d} \delta v v a \tau o ́ \nu$ in 18 sqq ., we expect to be told that the young should learn those melodies which are suitable to them and not beyond their powers, and not to be told, as we in fact are, that they should learn those melodies which will be the only ones suitable and practicable for them when they are past a certain age. Perhaps, however, the writer does mean that the relaxed modes are suitable both to the young and to the old; this seems to be
 the coming age also as well as for that of youth.' If this is his meaning, however, and there is nothing defective in the text, he must be allowed to have expressed it in a very imperfect way.
20. каì тaûta, i.e. $\tau \grave{a}$ סvvađà кaì тà $\pi \rho \in ́ \pi \sigma \nu \tau a$, as well as $\tau \grave{\alpha} \mu \epsilon ́ \sigma a$ :

 the same for boys and for men of full age and for old men.



 à $\sigma \epsilon \epsilon \nu \eta$ каi ù úv́vara $\pi \rho o ̀ s ~ \tau \grave{\eta} \nu \kappa i \nu \eta \sigma \iota \nu$, and Plut. An seni sit gerenda Respublica, c. 18 , quoted above on $\mathbf{1 7}$-34. Oí à $\pi \epsilon \iota \rho \eta \kappa$ ótes $\delta$ ià $\chi$ ро́vò (cp. 4 (7).9.1329a33) are distinguished from those who are in the same state from other causes: see Bonitz (Ind. 7 I b 45), who groups with the passage before us Hist. An. 6. 18. $57^{2}$ a 18 ,

24. ötı tàs áveıpévas áppovías k.т.入. Cp. Plato, Rep. 398 E,



25. ©́s $\mu \in \theta_{\text {uotıkàs k.t. } \lambda \text {., 'taking them as connected with intoxi- }}$ cation, not conformably to the influence of intoxication (for intoxication makes men rather frenzied revellers), but as enfeebled and exhausted.'
 seems to be modelled on 1342 a 28 sq. and to be intended to contradict it. Kai, 27 , implies that the study of relaxed modes by the young (for with $\delta \epsilon \hat{\imath}$ we must supply toùs véovs or tov̀s $\nu \epsilon \omega \tau$ '́िمovs) will be useful to them at their actual time of life as well as with a view to the coming time of life (see above on $17-34$ ). We expect not $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \omega \bar{\nu} \pi \rho \epsilon \sigma \beta v \tau \epsilon \in \rho \omega \nu$, but $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{a} \pi \epsilon \iota \rho \eta \kappa o ́ \tau \omega \nu$ סià $\chi \rho o ́ \nu o \nu$, and we must
 1335 b 29 sqq.), but for some reason the wider term is preferred.
 (cp. 17 sq.). The apodosis of this sentence is missing in a lacuna after áp $\mu \boldsymbol{\nu} \iota \hat{\omega} \nu, 33$. It seems better to adopt this view (with Sus.) than (with Schn. Cor. and Göttling) to place a colon instead of a full stop after тoเoúт $\omega \nu, 29$, and to connect ${ }^{\epsilon \prime} \tau \iota \delta^{\prime} \epsilon \ell ้ \tau \iota s, 29-$ $\dot{a} \rho \mu o \nu \iota \omega \nu, 33$, with what precedes. As to the lacuna after $\dot{a} \rho \mu o \nu \iota \omega$ see critical note.
30. For тoıaút followed by $\eta$, see above on 1266 b 36 .
31. кó $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ ov, probably 'orderliness': cp. 8 (6). 8. 132 I b 7 , $\pi \rho$ òs єỉtȧ̧ià кaì kó $\sigma \mu \nu$, and Plut. Lycurg. c. 4, quoted above on 134 I b 32.
33. тoúrous öpous tpeis. For the absence of the article see above on 1253 b II.

## APPENDIX A.

Collation of Brit. Mus. MS. Harl. 6874 with the text of the Berlin Academy edition of Aristotle (ed. Bekker, 1831).

I am indebted to the kindness of Mr. F. G. Kenyon for the following collation of Brit. Mus. MS. Harl. 6874.

The MS. contains the First Book of the Politics with the exception of the latter part of its last chapter, from 1260 a 26 , tò ò $\rho 0 \theta_{0-}$ $\pi \rho a y \in i v$, to the end. It also contains 6 (4). 15. 1300 a $24-\mathrm{I} 301$ a
 with the word $\delta \eta \mu 0 \tau \kappa \kappa \dot{a}$, and 7 (5). 1. 1302 a $3^{-1} 302$ b 3 1, beginning with the words $\phi$ aùdov. фavepòv $\delta^{\circ}$ and ending with the word Mevapé $\omega \nu$. 'It is of octavo size, measuring $8 \frac{7}{8} \mathrm{in} . \times 5^{7} \mathrm{in}$. It is on vellum, written in a very neat hand, apparently of the first half of the fifteenth century. There is nothing to show how it came into its present fragmentary condition, as it was rebound when acquired by Lord Oxford' (Letter from Mr. Kenyon).

The MS. does not, as far as I see, contain anything new except in one passage, 1253 b 8 , where a 'lacuna quasi trium litterarum inter $\pi o \hat{i o \nu}$ et $\delta \in \hat{i}$ ' is noted. None of the seventeen MSS. examined by or for Susemihl in 1252-1254 a 17 (see his edition of the Politics of 1872 , p. xxviii) have any lacuna there. It is possible that $\tau c$ has dropped out. But the MS. belongs to the better type of the second family and is nearly allied to $\mathrm{P}^{2.3}$ (especially to $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ ), two MSS. which, with $\mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$, the Vatican Palimpsest Fragments, and the Latin Translation of the Vetus Interpres, stand at the head of the authorities for the text of the Politics. Of course it has many errors of its own, and when it agrees with $\mathrm{P}^{2.3}$, some of the inferior MSS. often do so too, but sometimes it agrees with $\mathrm{P}^{2.3}$ where none of the inferior MSS. do so (this is the case in $1_{2} 5^{2}$ a 15, 1253 a 16, 1254 b 2, 1257 a 13, 16, 1300 b 24, 26). I have
noticed only two or three passages in which it sides with inferior
 $\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{pr}$. $\mathrm{P}^{6}$, and in $\mathrm{I}^{2} 57$ b 2 I it has $\dot{\eta}$ with $\mathrm{P}^{4.6} \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{L}^{8}$ Ald., not $\hat{\eta}^{\eta}$ as $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1,2,3} \mathrm{~T}^{\mathrm{b}}$.

It often stands alone or almost alone in agreement with $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ : thus in


```
            prima manu,
    b \(2 \epsilon_{\epsilon} \kappa\) is omitted by pr. \(\mathrm{P}^{3}\) pr. Harl,
1256 а 17 то́тépos Harl. pr. P3,
    b 35 où \(\begin{gathered}\text { è } \\ \mu \text { uas } \\ \mathrm{M} \\ \mathrm{s} \\ \mathrm{P}^{3} \\ \text { Harl., }\end{gathered}\)
```




```
    10 ë́रo \(^{2} \mathrm{P}^{3}\) Harl.
```

But $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ has many false readings which Harl. has not, and in two passages Harl. shows a striking resemblance to $P^{2}$ : thus in 1255 a 37 we find $\epsilon^{k}$ yóvoov in $\mathrm{P}^{2} \mathrm{Q} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{b}}$ Harl., and in $\mathrm{I}_{3} \mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{~b}$ 19 Ald. pr. $\mathrm{P}^{2}$
 (marg. $\mu \grave{\eta}$ aivé́ovitau prima manu). It is obvious, therefore, that Harl, is not copied from $\mathrm{P}^{3}$.

The glosses found in Harl. in $\mathrm{r}_{3} 02 \mathrm{a} 28$ and b 4 are found also in red ink in the margin of $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ and in a later hand than the MS. in the margin of $\mathrm{P}^{3}$ (see Susemihl's edition of 1872 in these passages). Harl. does not seem to have the glosses which are found in $\mathrm{P}^{2}$ but not in $\mathrm{P}^{3}$.
 iota subscripto nunquam adhibito. 15. кarà 入óyovs] кatà toùs $\lambda o ́ y o u s . ~ 16 . ~ a ̈ \lambda ~ \eta \theta \hat{\eta}$ om. MS., ins. in marg. alia manu. 19. $\mu \epsilon ́ \chi \rho \iota \iota \omega \hat{\omega} \nu$ d̆ $\sigma v v \theta$ ét $\omega \nu$ om. MS. 20.
 om. MS. 32. ä́pXov om. MS.
b 8. $\phi а \sigma \iota \nu] ~ \phi а \sigma i ̀ v . ~ 10 . ~ к о \iota \nu \omega \nu \omega ิ \nu] ~ к о \iota \nu \omega \nu і ̈ \mu \omega \nu . ~ 12 . ~ \pi e ́ v \eta \sigma i v ~$

 $\delta \dot{\eta}] \delta \dot{\delta} \mathrm{E}$. $\quad$ 32. $\tau \hat{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{s}$ om. MS.
1253 a 1. тễos] кaì тétos.
4. фaù入ós écrub] фaù̀os écriv̀, et ita fere semper. 7. $\ddot{a} \breve{v} \nu \hbar \nu]$ lacuna in MS. $\quad$ 9. $\eta$ om.


 àфробıбia.


 lacuna quasi trium litterarum inter moîv et $\delta \in \bar{i}$.
 ठ̀̇. 35. aúvov̂] aủroû. 36. oũs $\phi \eta \sigma \iota \nu]$ ov̂s $\phi \eta \sigma$ tiv. 37. av̉тai] aṽ่




 тє́pas.
b 2. $\pi a \rho a ̀$ ] $\pi \epsilon \rho \stackrel{\imath}{\mathrm{L}}$.
9. $\pi \hat{\alpha} \sigma \iota \nu] \pi \hat{a} \sigma \ddot{i}$.




1255 a 2-4. кaì סíkatóv . . . тò סou入єúєt om. MS. 5. кaì post tıs om. MS. 7. фaनıv] фабit. 10. креіттоעоs] креітто⿱.
 26. $\tau t s]$ Tis. 29. סoúdovs] סoû̀os. 31. є єiто $\mu \tau \nu]$


 $\phi \eta \sigma i]$ фабi (ut videtur : corr. sec. manu). 37. є̌куоvov] éx. yóvoıv.
b 2. ék additur supra lineam prima manu. 7. rò ante

 $\delta \epsilon \sigma \pi$ óris. 32. $\tau \hat{\varphi} \kappa \tau \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta a l] \tau \bar{\omega} \nu \tau \hat{a} \sigma \theta a \iota$. 38. $\tau \iota s] \tau i s$, et ita saepe.


 ả $\lambda a \gamma \eta{ }^{2}$.
b 5. $\left.\lambda_{\eta} \eta \tau \tau \iota \kappa o ́ \nu\right]$ § $\left.\left.\delta \eta \sigma \tau \rho \iota \kappa o ̀ \nu . ~ 6 . ~ r o u ̀ s\right] ~ \tau a ̀ s . ~ 8 . ~ \tau \epsilon \lambda \epsilon \iota \omega \theta \epsilon i \sigma \tau \nu\right]$
 16. $\tau \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda a$ ] $\tau \dot{a}$ ä $\lambda \lambda a$. 28. $\dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau i]$ ध́ $\sigma \tau i ̈ . ~ 32 . ~ \dot{a} \gamma a \theta \dot{\eta} \nu]$
 41. $\left.\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \tau \iota \kappa \eta \nu^{\prime}\right] \chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \kappa \eta ̀ \nu$.

VOLL. III.








 $\mu \eta k \bar{\jmath}$.
b 13. $\pi 0 \hat{v}] ~ \tau o v ̂ . ~ 14 . ~ k \tau \eta े \sigma \iota s] ~ k \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \tau s . ~ 15 . ~ \lambda o i \pi \hat{\omega} \nu ~ o m . ~ M S . ~$




 28. тойт○] тоиิто. 29. $\left.\gamma^{\prime}\right]$ $\gamma$ ¢. 35. $\pi \dot{\rho} \rho \omega \nu$ om. MS. 37. $\mu \hat{\rho} \rho \eta$ om. MS.







BOOK IV. c. 15 .









 deficit MS.

## BOOK V.c. т.

 14. $\dot{\eta}$ ṫк $\tau \bar{\omega} \nu . . . \hat{\eta}$ om. MS. 16. yizvourau] yivouta.


b 2. Post $\tilde{v}_{\beta} \beta \rho \nu$ iterantur verba $\delta^{\circ}$ à $\delta i \kappa \omega \omega$ s $\pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu \epsilon \kappa \tau o u v \tau a s ~ \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu$, sed ab ipso scriba error notatur. 4. Post тоótou



 manu). 31. Post verbum Meqapé $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ deficit MS.

## APPENDIX B.

## On the use of Hyperbaton in the Politics.

Hyperbaton is much used in the Politics-more, I think, than in the Nicomachean Ethics-for the purpose of emphasizing a particular word or words.

Kühner's account of Hyperbaton (Ausführl. gr. Gramm., ed. 2, §607. I) is as follows-' In Hyperbaton two words forming together a unity are severed by the interposition of one or more less important words. By means of this severance prominence is given, as a rule, to one only of the severed words, that which stands first, but often also to both of them, especially when both are placed in emphatic positions in the sentence, for instance at the beginning or end of it.' In one particular this account is open to amendment. The severed words are not always only two in number ; they are more than two, for instance, in Pol. 4 (7). 1. 1323 b $3^{8}$, oüre mávras тоùs oỉk

In the following passages the emphasis appears to fall on the first only of the severed words :-




 тoûto èv náaals vinápXé.

In the following passages，on the other hand，the emphasis appears to fall on both，or all，the severed words：－





 є́єє́pous，
 трiá，
 єival toùs mo入ítas，


The following words are among those most often emphasized in

 and roios．

Occasionally two sets of words are thus emphasized in the same

 $\pi$ тдıт $i a s$ are emphasized by severance，and in 8 （6）．4．1319 b ro，
 and oikcîov $\mu \hat{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu$ are similarly emphasized．

Groups of words linked by кai or $\eta$ 向 are often emphasized in this way ：e．g．in
 тò ßávavao $\hat{\text { 亿̀ }} \mathfrak{\xi} \in \nu$ LKóv，
 єivaє kai tòv $\theta$ ท̂ta тo入ítas，

3．10．1281 a 24，ả $\lambda \lambda$ ’ ảpa toùs é̉ $\lambda$ átrous סíkatov ẳ $\rho \chi \epsilon \iota \nu$ kaì toùs $\pi$ गoưíous ；
 $\tau \hat{\nu} \nu \chi^{i \lambda}{ }^{\boldsymbol{i} \omega \nu}$ ．

It should be added that，though in nearly all the cases of the severance of connected words which have been examined by me in the Politics the aim evidently is to throw emphasis on particular words，I have noticed two or three passages in which this cannut
be said to be clearly the case. They are passages in which the relative is severed from its substantive. We have in
 $\theta$ é $\sigma$ ets raútas,

 (contrast 5 (8). 1. 1337 a 24 , ồ $\tau \rho o ́ \pi o \nu ~ \nu \hat{\nu \nu ~}$


Is any emphasis intended to be thrown on the severed words in these three passages ?

## APPENDIX C.

On the variations in the order of words in $\Pi^{1}$ and $\Pi^{2}$.
A considerable proportion of the variations in the order of words which we observe in $\Pi^{1}$ and $\Pi^{2}$ may be arranged in classes.

1. There are those in which $\Pi^{2}$ sever the adjective or pronoun from the substantive with which it agrees, while $\Pi^{1}$ place them together:-

``` \(\Pi^{1}\) ),
```







``` даiò \(\square^{1}\) ),
```



``` perhaps r ),
```




``` тaúras ס̀a日é \(\sigma\) es \(\Pi^{1}\) ),
```





```入iav \(\Pi^{1}\) ),
```









2. There are those in which $\Pi^{2}$ sever words from the words they govern, while $\Pi^{1}$ group the words together. A substantive, for instance, is often severed from the genitive it governs by $\Pi^{2}$, where it is not so severed by $\Pi^{1}$. Thus $\Pi^{2}$ have in


 Boúגєтaı $\Pi^{1}$ ),
 $\nu \eta \pi$ ious $\Pi^{1}$ ),
 évdé $\chi \in \tau a \imath \Pi^{1}$ ),
 $\left.\tau \rho \epsilon i ̄ s \Pi^{1}\right)$.

A similar tendency appears in the following passages, though in a less marked degree :-
 $\mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly r ),
 $\Pi^{1}$ ),


 тต̂̀ тotoúr $\omega \nu$ cï $\omega \theta \mathrm{E} \mathrm{M}^{\mathrm{s} P}{ }^{1}$ and possibly $\Gamma$ ),
 $\Pi^{1}$ ).
3. In all the above passages the order of words adopted in $n^{2}$ is more broken and more emphatic than that adopted in $\Pi^{1}$, and

[^12]the following passages also show a leaning on the part of $\Pi^{2}$ to a more emphatic order（in the first five the adjective is placed before the substantive by $\Pi^{2}$ ）：－
 $\mu i a \Pi^{1}$ ），
1280 а I5，фаû̀o兀 крıтаі̀ $\Pi^{2}$（крıтаі фаи̂入o七 $\Pi^{1}$ ），
1290 b 8，$\pi \lambda$ єiova $\mu$ ópla $\Pi^{2}$（ $\mu$ ópla $\pi \lambda$ ciova $\Pi^{1}$ ），







 $\beta є \lambda \tau \iota \tau \tau a$ үіцŋтає $\Pi^{1}$ ），



Yet sometimes $\Pi^{1}$ place words in the more emphatic order． Thus they have in
 （eivaı $\sigma$ óфpova $\Pi^{2}$ ），
 pous $\Gamma$（roùs k $\lambda$ そ́pous ảvivous cỉXo $\Pi^{2}$ ），



1282 a 40，$\tau 0 u ́ \tau \omega \nu \pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu\left(\pi a ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu ~ \tau o u ́ \tau \omega \nu \Pi^{2}\right)$ ，
 бофєір $\Pi^{2}$ ），

 фє́́yovą фóvov $\Pi^{2}$ ），
 $\left.\sigma v \nu \epsilon \chi \bar{\omega} \varsigma \Pi^{2}\right)$ ，

4．In some passages the genitive is differently placed in $\Pi^{1}$ and $\Pi^{2}$ ：
 perhaps $\Gamma$ ，



 бтáбє由s $\Pi^{1}$ ).





The variations classified in the foregoing pages amount to nearly half the entire number of variations in the order of words in $\Pi^{l}$ and $\Pi^{2}$.

## APPENDIX D.

Reminiscences in the Politics of passages in the writings of Plain and other Greek authors and of dicta of notable men.

We are concerned in this Appendix not with explicit references, but with reminiscences, or apparent reminiscences, of a tacit kind. I have endeavoured to gather together in it those noticed in the commentary, or most of them, and a few which I have observed since I wrote it, beginning with reminiscences of Plato's writings or dicta. Many reminiscences have no doubt escaped me, but those which are here pointed out may serve in some degree to throw light on the direction and extent of Aristotle's reading in connexion with the Politics.
i. Plato.

| 2. 108 | 1252 b 5 sqq. | Laws $805 \mathrm{D}-\mathrm{E}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 114, 117 | 16 sqq. | - 776 A, 680 A sqq. |
| 122 | 1253 a 8 | Polit. 267 B sq., 276 A ? |
| 162 | 1255 b 20 sq. | - 259 B |
| 177 sq. | 1256 b 23 sqq. <br> $125^{8}$ a 10 sqq | Sophist 222 B-C, Laws 823 B Laws 962 A, Rep. 397 E |
| 224 | 1260 b 5 sq. | - 777 E (cp. 720 B sqq.). |
| 260 | 1264 a 25 | Rep. 422 E |
| 268 | 1265 a 23 | Laws 625 C sq. |
| 270 | b 1 sqq. | - 928 E sq. |
| 271 | 7-10 | Rep. 460 A |


| 2. $3^{15}$ | 1269 a 34 sqq. | Laws 776 C sqq. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 317 | b 14 sqq. | - 781 A sq., 806 C |
| 322 | 1270 a 4 sqq. | - 780-ı, esp. 780 B and 78 IA |
| 337 | b 34 sq. | Rep. 548 B |
| $35^{8}$ | 1272b 9 sqq. | Laws 712 E |
| 3. 163 | 1277 a 26 sq. | Laws 643 E |
| 169 | b II sqq. | - 762 E ? |
| 172 | 24 Sq. | Meno 71 E |
|  | 25 sqq. | Rep. 433 C |
| 189 | 1279 a 3 sq. | - 341 C-D |
| 196 | b 17 sq. | - 550 C |
| 207 | 1280 b 20 sqq. | - $3^{69}$ A sqq. |
| 212 | I281 a 34 sqq. | Laws 7 I 3 E sqq. |
| 222 | 1282 a 15 sq . | - 701 A |
| 223 | 20 sqq. | Rep. 601 D, Cratyl. 390 |
|  | 25 sqq. | Laws 945 B sqq. |
| 225 sq. | b 14 sqq. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } 75^{6} \mathrm{E}-75^{8} \mathrm{~A} \text {, esp. } 757 \mathrm{C} \text {, } \\ & \text { Rep. } 540 \text { D sq. } \end{aligned}$ |
| 227 | 23 sqq. | Gorg. 490 B sqq. |
| 236 | 1283 a 40 sqq. | - 488 D |
| 238 | b 23 sqq. | - 489 E sqq. |
| 240 | 1284 a 3 sqq. | Rep. 540 D |
| 285 | 1286 b 3 sqq. | - 445 D |
| 296 sq. | 1287 a $3^{8}$ sqq. | Polit. 298 A sq., 300 A |
| 303 | 1288 a 4 sq. | Plato ap. Diog. Laert. 3. 18 ? |
| 306 | 41 sqq . | Polit. 292 B, E, 259 B |
| 311 | I 323 a 36 sqq. | Apol. Socr. 29 D, E |
| $3^{12}$ | 40 sqq . | - 30 A sq. |
| 318 | b 29 sqq. | Rep. 435 B sq., 441 C sq. |
| 322 | 1324 a 27 sq. | Theaet. 175 D sq., Rep. 476 A sq. |
| 323 | 32 sqq. | Gorg. 500 C |
| 326 | b 9 sqq. | Laws 637 D |
| 331 | 4 I sqq. | - 704 C |
| 338 | 1325 b $21-23$ | Polit. 259 C, E |
| 341 | 40 sqq . | Laws 709 C sqq. |
| 346 | 1326 b 2 sq. | Rep. 369 D |
| 347 | 7 sqq. | Same passage |
| 348 | 14 sqq. | Laws 738 D sq., 75 I D, 766 E |
| $35^{\circ}$ | 26 sqq. | - 704 C , Critias 110 E |
| 351 | 30 sqq. | - 737 D, Critias 112 C |
| $35^{8}$ | 1327 a 19 sqq. | - 705 A |


| 586 | APPENDIX D. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3. $3^{61}$ | 1327 a 37 sqq. | Laws 952 D sqq. |
| 368 | 1328 a 6 sq. | Rep. 375 B |
|  | 8 sqq. | - 375 D sqq. |
| 375 | b 6 sqq. | - 369 C sq., Critias I 10 C |
| 391 | 1330 a 14 sqq. | Laws 745 C |
| 394 | 26 | - 777 C sq. |
| 395 | $3^{1}$ sqq. | - 777 C sqq. |
| 406 | b $3^{2}$ sqq. | - 778 D |
| 419 | r33 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ I 3 sqq. | - 848 C sqq., 760 B sqq. 762 B sq. |
| 420 | 20 sqq. | - 745 B |
| 422 | 26 sqq. | - 962 A sq. |
|  | 39 sq. | Meno 78 A |
| 425 | 1332 a 11 sqq. | Laws 728 C, 859 D-860 B |
| 43 I | 40 sqq. | Plato ap. Plut. Marius, c. $4^{6}$ |
| 434 | b 16 sqq. | Polit. 301 D sq. |
| 436 | 37 sq. | Laws 690 A, Rep. 412 C |
| 442 | 1 333 a 35 | - 628 D sq., 803 D |
| 454 | 1334 b 9 sq. | - $653 \mathrm{~B}, 659 \mathrm{D}$ |
| 455 | 12 sqq. | Phaedr. 245 D |
| 456 | 22 sqq. | Rep. 44 I A sq. |
| 457 | 27 sq. <br> 29 sqq. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { - } 591 \mathrm{C} \text { sq. } \\ & \text { Laws } 721 \mathrm{~A} \end{aligned}$ |
| 477 | 1335 b 38 sqq. | - $784 \mathrm{E}, 84 \mathrm{I}$ C sqq. |
| 480 | 1336 a 8 sqq. | Theaet. $\mathrm{I}_{53} \mathrm{~A}, \mathrm{~B}$, Laws 789 E |
| 485 | 30 sqq. | Rep. 376 E sq. |
| 486 | 33 sq. | Laws 643 B sq. |
| 487 | 34 sqq. | - 79 I E sqq. |
| 489 | 4 I sqq. | 794 |
| 490 | b 6 sqq. | - 729 B |
| 495 | 33 | Rep. 378 D sq. |
| 496 | 35 sqq. | - 466 Esq . |
| 499 | 1337 a 14 sqq. | - 544 D sq. |
| 501 | 23 sqq. | Laws 804 C-D, 8ıo A |
| 502 | 27 sqq. | - 923 A sq. |
|  | 29 sqq. | - 903 B , Charm. 156 E |
| 506 | b 2 sq. | Laches 190 B sq. |
| 507 | 8 sqq. $\}$ | Rep. 495 D sq. |
|  | 1342 a 22 sq. $\}$ | Rep. 495 D sq. |
| 512 | ${ }^{1} 337$ b 35 sq. | Laws 803 D sq. |
| 519 | 1338 b 6 sqq. | - 794 C |


| 3. 520 | 1338 b 9 sqq. | Rep. 410 D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 529 | 1339 a 26 sqq. | Laws 819 B, 820 D ? |
| 534 | b 33 | - 658 E sq. |
| 536 | 1340 a 5 sqq. | Rep. 401 D, Tim. 47 D |
| 538 | 18 sqq. | - 399 A sqq. |
| 542 | 42 sqq. | - 398 D sqq. |
| 550 | 1341 a 10 sq . | Laws 812 D sq. ? |
| 557 | b io sqq. | Gorg. 501 B-502 A |
| 571 | 1342 b 17 sqq . | Laws $785 \mathrm{~B}, 670 \mathrm{D}$ |
| 4. 139 | $1288 \mathrm{~b}_{41}$ | Rep. 50 A A, 540 Esq . |
| ${ }^{1} 8$ | 1290 a 30 sqq . | Polit. 291 D |
| 181 | $1292 \mathrm{a}^{1}$ | Rep. 557 C sqq., Laws 712 E |
| 204 | 1294 b 18 sq. | Laws 712 D sqq. |
| 211 | 1295 b 4 sqq. | - 679 B sq., 728 D-729 A |
| 212 | 13 sqq. | - $728 \mathrm{D}-729 \mathrm{~A}, 79 \mathrm{I}$ |
| 213 | 21 sqq. | Menex. 238 E sq., Laws 756 E sq., 712 E, Rep. 417 A-B |
| 217 | 1296 a 8 sq. | Laws 744 D |
| 258 | 1299 a 25 sqq. | Polit. 260 C sqq. |
| 260 | $3^{8}$ sqq. | Rep. $370 \mathrm{C}, 374 \mathrm{~A}$ sqq., Laws 846 D sqq. |
| 286 | I 3 Or b 4 sq. | Laws 690 D |
| 290 | 26 sq . | - 757 A |
|  | 29 | - 757 A sqq. |
| 291 | 1302 a 2 sqq. | 757 E |
| 309 | 1303 a 25 sq . | 708 D |
| 322 | b 28 sq. | - 792 C |
| 336 | 1304 b 22 sqq. | Rep. 565 A sqq. |
| $35^{8}$ | 1306a 19-3 ${ }^{\text {I }}$ | - $5551 \mathrm{I}^{\text {dq }}$. |
| 371 | 1307 a 17 sq. | Gorg. 483 C |
| 376 | 40 sqq. | Phaedr. 262 A, Rep. 424 B-E |
| 379 | b 30 sqq . | Rep. 424 B-E |
| 406 | 1309 b 18 sqq. | Laws 701 E, Rep. 562 |
|  | 20 sqq. | Rep. 562 B |
| 409 | $\begin{array}{r} 13 \text { ro a } 12 \mathrm{sqq} . \\ 34 \mathrm{sqq} . \end{array}$ | - $55^{2}$ E, Laws 793, 870 A <br> Laws 715 D |
| 415 | b 12 sqq. | Rep. 568 Esq . |
| 438 | 1312 a 26 sqq . | Symp. 208 C sq. |
| $44^{2}$ | b 19 sq. | Rep. $5^{67}$ C sq. |
| 446 | 1313 a 19 sqq. | Laws $690 \mathrm{D}-\mathrm{E}, \mathrm{6}_{9} \mathrm{I}$ D sqq. |
| 447 | 25 sqq. | - 69 r D sqq. |

4. 456 I 313 b 18 sqq. Rep. 567 A
$459 \quad 28$ sq. -566 E
477 1315 b 8 sqq. $\quad-580 \mathrm{~A}$
494 1317 а 4 I sqq. $-5^{62} \mathrm{~B}$ sq.
507
518
539
549
557

$$
1318 \text { b } 1 \text { sqq. }
$$

1318 b 1 sqq. Laws 663 E
1320 b 33 sqq.

- 695 A

Rep. $55^{6} \mathrm{E}$
I32 $\quad$ b 14 sqq.

- 37 II B

Crito 50 B
ii. Isocrates.
2. 122 sq. 1253 a 9 sqq. Nicocl. § 5 sqq., De Antid. §§ $253-$ 257
$155 \quad 1255$ a $14 \quad$ Philip. § 15
177 sq. 1256 b 23 sqq. Panath. § 163
228 1260 b 33 sqq.
De Antid. § 83
$375 \quad 1274 \mathrm{a} 14 \mathrm{sq}$. $\quad$ - 316 sqq .
3. $190 \quad 1279$ a 10 sqq. Areop. § 24 sq.

447 I 333 b $3^{8}$ sqq. Panath. § 219 sq.
$44^{8} \quad 1334$ a 8 sqq. De Pace $\S 96$
4. 2041294 b 18 sqq. Areop. § 6I, Nicocl. § 24

3341304 b 20 sqq. De Pace $\S \S$ 108, 122 sq.
$340 \quad 1305$ a 7 sqq. - § 54 sq., Philip. § 140
409 I3Io a 12 sqq. Areop. § 40 sqq.
420 b 40 sqq. Ad Nicocl. § 16
454 I313 b 6 sqq. Paneg. § i5 I
$460 \quad 29$ sqq. Hel. § 33, De Pace § iir 2
468 1314 b 2 I sq. Ad Nicocl. §§ 11, 24
477 I315 b 8 sqq. Hel. § 34
512 1319 a 2 sqq. Ad Nicocl. § 16
535 I 320 a 39 sq. Areop. § $3{ }^{2}$
iii. Xenophon.
2. 162,1641255 b 20 sqq., 33 Oecon. 13. 5, 21. 10

| 3. 172 | 1277 b 24 sq . | - | 7. 25 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 210 | 128 I a 11 sqq. | Mem | 1. 2. 42 sqq |
| $\bigcirc$ | 1287 b 26 sqq. | Cyro | 8. 2. 10-12 |
| 344 | 1326 a $3^{2}$ sqq. | - | 8. 7.22 |
| 365 | ${ }_{1327}{ }^{\text {b b }} 25$ sqq. | - | 1. |
| 414 | 1331 a $3^{\text {r }}$ sqq. | - | I. 2. 3 sq. |


| 4. 198 | 1294 a 3 sq. | Oecon. 9. 14 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 258 | 1299 a 25 sqq. | Mem. 3. 9. 11 |
| 260 | 38 sqq. | Cyrop. 2. I. 21 |
| 446 | 1313 a 21 sqq . | Rep. Lac. $\mathrm{r}_{5} .8$ |
| 460 | b 29 sqq. | Cyrop. 8. 7. I $_{3}$, Hiero 3.7 sqq., I. $3^{8}$ |
| 472 | 1315 a 6 sqq. | Hiero 9. 3 |
| 475 | 37 sq. | - 6.5 |
| 542 | 1321 a 19 sq . | Cyrop. 2. 1. 8? |

## iv. Homer.

The reminiscences of Homer noticed by me are more doubtful, but possible reminiscences of the Iliad are pointed out in 2. 257 , 3. $214,273,295,301,343,379,436$ (compare also 2. 5. 1263 a 11 sqq. with Il. 1. 165-168), and of the Odyssey in 2. 239, 3. 177.
v. Reminiscences of the writings of the following authors also seem to occur in the Politics:-

Aeschines 4. 198, 255 ? (see also 4. 214)
Aeschylus 4.460
Aristophanes 4. 179, 5 10? (see also 3.214 sq.)
Democritus 3. 489
Ephorus 2. 347-350, 4. 219
Eubulus, the comic poet, 4.462
Euripides 2. $35^{8}$ ?, 3. 459, 4.2 II, 391, 460 ?, 46 I
Herodotus $3 \cdot 3^{26}, 4 \cdot 4^{61}$ (see also 3 . 150 sq., 4. 208)
Hippias of Elis 4. 297 sq.
Hippocrates 3. 401, 473, 483,532 (compare also 1. 8. 1256 a $3^{2}$ sqq. with Hippocr. De Aere, Aquis, Locis, vol. 1. p. 556 Kühn, foot)
Melanippides $3.55^{6}$
Pratinas 3.542
Solon 3. 169, 228, 350, 4. 139?, 290, 391, 408
Telestes $3.55^{6}$ :
and reminiscences of sayings ascribed to
Alcibiades 2. 337
Anacharsis 3. $5^{22}$
Epaminondas 3. 523
the Lacedaemonians 3.525
Pelopidas 3.423
the Pythagoreans 2. 142 sq.:
of other sayings $3.556,4.32 \mathrm{I}, 507$ : of proverbs $3.238,417$, 46I ?, 598, 4. 226?, 290?

Reminiscences may also occur, though this is more doubtful, of the writings of

Anaxandrides 3. 201, 397
Antiphanes 2. ${ }^{5} 5^{2}$
Archilochus 4.465 (quoted 3. 368)
Eupolis 3.429 sq.
Heraclitus 2. 153 (quoted 4. 474)
Lysias 3. 150, 4. 334
Phrynichus, the comic poet, 2.120
Pindar 2. 131, $\mathrm{I}_{53}$, $\mathrm{I}_{57}$, 3. 399, 4. 182
Theognis 4. 226, 297, 3 2I, 391
Thucydides 2. 308, $3.525,4.294,402,416$,
and of sayings ascribed to Aristides 4. 403, Aristippus, 2. 287, Socrates, $3.217,43 \mathrm{I}$, and Themistocles, $4.4{ }^{\circ} 3$.

# ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS TO VOLS. I, II, AND III. 

Vol. I.
P. 15 , line 14, for $\pi \alpha \mu \pi o \lambda \lambda$ oì read $\pi \dot{\alpha} \mu \pi о \lambda \lambda o \iota$.
P. 20, eleven lines from foot of page, for compounds formed read things constituted.
P. 34, line 14. A. Schmekel (Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa, p. 375) takes the reference in the words 'docti homines' (Cic. De Rep. 1. 24. 38) to be to Aristotle, while C. Hinze (Quos scriptores Graecos Cicero in libris de re publica componendis adhibuerit, p. 50 sq.) takes it to be to Panaetius.
P. 148, line 9, for Hecuba read Helen.
P. 236, lines ${ }^{5}-27$. See as to the two arguments here summarized the explanatory notes on 3.4. 1276 b 37 and $1277^{\text {a }} 5$ (vol. iii. pp. 157-159).
P. 237 , five lines from foot of page, for from read after, and dele first.
P. 242, line I sq. As to this recapitulation, however, see note on 3.5. 1278 a 34 (vol. iii. p. 182).
P. 243, line 8 sq. I have given a slightly different translation of this sentence in the explanatory note on 3.6 .1278 b 8 (vol. iii. p. 184 sq.).
P. 264, six lines from foot of page, 'his disciple Dicaearchus'. See however below on vol. ii. pp. xiii and xiv.
P. 270 , note I. In the quotation from 3.16. 1287 b 6 for $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \tau \epsilon$ read ${ }^{\omega} \sigma \tau^{\prime} \epsilon i$ (see critical note on 1287 b 6 ).
P. 272, line I, for compensation read return (see vol. iii. p. 282 sq.).
P. 278 , lines $17-20$, add a reference to Diod. 16. 92. 5 and 95. I, and Stob. Floril. 98. 70.
P. 286, note. The term 'mortal god' is borrowed by Hobbes from Aristotle: see Cic. De Fin. 2. I3. 40, sic hominem ad duas res, ut ait Aristoteles, ad intellegendum et ad agendum esse natum quasi mortalem deum (Aristot. Fragm. 48. 1483 b 15 : Rose ${ }^{2}$, Fragm. 61).
P. 290, line 14, for leadership read rule.
P. 297, note 2. Mr. Shute's essay 'On the history of the process by which the Aristotelian writings arrived at their present form' (Clarendon Press, 1888) has been published since my first and second volumes appeared. See p. 164 sqq. of the essay.
P. 299, note 1, first column, last line but two, for 30 read 81 .
P. $3^{24}$, note I. See critical note on 133 I b 4 (vol. iii. p. 112).
P. 325 , in the quotation from Ion of Chios (Fragm. $\sigma_{3}$ Nauck), after $\epsilon{ }^{\top} \tau^{\circ}$ add à $\nu$.
P. 348 , note $\mathbf{I}$, lines $\mathrm{r}-2$, read We find this many-sidedness and versatility more often realized, etc.
P. 363 , lines 2 I-24. See however vol. iii. p. 540.
P. 366 , line I sqq. See as to the passage here summarized the critical note on I341 b 19-26 (vol. iii. p. 126 sq.).
P. 366 , last line, for The melodies also read Just as the sacred melodies produce this effect, so the melodies. (See the explanatory note on 5 (8).7.I342 a ${ }^{1} 5$ in vol. iii. p. 566 sq.)
P. 366 , note 1 , and p. 369 , note. See the explanatory note on 5 (8). 7. 1 342 b ${ }^{17-34}$ (vol. iii. p. 571 sq.)
P. 375 , line 24 , for thus composed read composed of owners of complete lots.
P. 443, seven lines from foot of page, 'he abandons'. This is true, subject to what is said in p. 435 , line 14 sqq.
P. 445, last line but one. See the explanatory note on 6 (4). 14. 1298 b 20 (vol. iv. p. 249).
P. 456 , note. Add Plato, Polit. 299 B sqq. to the passages referred to.
P. 470, lines 20-22. See the explanatory note on 6 (4). II. I296 a 38 sqq.
P. 502, four lines from foot of page, 'the rich encroach', etc. See explanatory note on 6 (4). I2. I297 a II for a closer rendering of this passage.
 than $\hat{\eta} \pi$ тодıтeía. See the critical note on 1298 b 8 and the explanatory note on 1298 b 5 .
P. 509, lines 14, 15. This will not be so if I am right in bracketing $\hat{\eta} \hat{\epsilon} k$ $\tau \tau \nu \omega{ }^{2} \nu$ with Spengel in 6 (4). 15. I 300 a 35 .
P. $5^{1} 3$, fourteen lines from foot of page, 'from each tribe or section of the State'. Probably rather 'from the $\gamma \nu \omega \rho \rho \mu \mu t$ and $\delta \bar{\eta} \mu o s$ ': see the explanatory note on 6 (4). 14. 1298 b 21 .
P. 519, note, second column, line 4, add For other statements in this chapter inconsistent with statements made elsewhere in the Politics, see vol. iv. pp. 44I, 485 sq.
P. 54I, last line but one, 'worth or' should perhaps be omitted: see the explanatory note on 7 (5). 10. 1310 b 34 .
P. $5^{66}$, seven lines from foot of page, for nor again where a wealthy majority rules over a minority of poor read nor again an oligarchy where the rich rule, because they are in a majority, over a minority of poor. (See critical note on 1290 b $I_{5}$ and explanatory note on 6 (4). 4.1290 b 14.)
P. 573 , line 18. 'This agrees sufficiently well with the account of aristocracy in the passage before us'. I have changed my opinion as to this, and now distinguish the aristocracy of the Third Book from that of the Fourth (old Seventh) : see above, p. xxxvi, and vol. iv. p. ix.
P. 575, end of Appendix E, after Aristotle's? add It should not, however, escape notice that if this part of c. Io (1329a 40-b 35) is an interpolation, it is an interpolation of old date, for the author of the epitome of the Political Theory of the Peripatetics which is preserved in the Eclogae of Stobacus
(2.6.17) seems to have had it before him when he says of the distribution of functions in the Fourth (old Seventh) Book of the Politics between the young,

 refers, however inaccurately, to the views expressed in this part of $\mathrm{c}: 10$.


## Vol. II.

Pp. xii-xvi. So far as the question has been investigated at present, it seems likely that neither Polybius nor Cicero had a first-hand acquaintance with the Politics, and that any resemblances traceable in their teaching to that of the Politics are due to their use of a work by an authority-probably Panaetiuswho had a first-hand acquaintance with the Politics. See A. Schmekel, Die Philosophie der mittleren Stoa, pp. $47-85$ and $374-379$, C. Hinze, Quos scriptores Graecos Cicero in libris de re pablica componendis adhibuerit, pp. II-2I and $29-55$, and Sus. ${ }^{4}$, vol. i, p. 660 sq.
P. xiii, last line but two, and p. xiv, note 3. See however as to Dicaearchus C. Hinze, op. cit. p. 23 sqq., where a different view is taken as to the probable subject of the T $\rho \iota \pi$ òıııкós of Dicaearchus.
P. xiv, note I. See Mr. Shute's essay, p. 40 sq.
P. xvii, line 19, after the Politics $a d d$ See also the explanatory note on 4 ( 7 ). 13. I332 a I9 as to Stob. Ecl. Eth. 2. 6. I2.
P. xviii sq. For a fuller list of apparent reminiscences of passages in the Politics see the heading Politics of Aristotle in the General Index (vol. iv. p. 642).
P. xix, line ro, after this passage add See, however, the explanatory note on 4 (7). 14. 1332 b 38.
P. xix, line 20, after 1333 a 30 add (see also explanatory note on 4 (7). 13. 1332 a 38 ).
 An. 4. 5.682 a 2 sq . and Isocr. De Antid. § 71.
P. xxviii, line 8 , after $\pi \epsilon \rho \grave{i}$ add $\tau \eta$ ท̂s.
P. xxix, line 1 , after 1338 a 32 sqq.: add .5 (8). 5 . 1339 b 10 sq.:
P. xxix, line 2, after 8 (6). I. add 1316b 36 sqq. and after 1316 b 39 sqq. add 1317 a 13 sqq.
P. xxxix, twelve lines from foot of page, for 'disiecta membra' read pieces.
P. xl, line 5, after the Seventh add In one MS. of Pliny's Natural History (the Pollingensis) 'the first eighteen Books are wrongly numbered ' (Class. Rev. 7.452).
P. xlviii, six lines from end of note 2 , dele in 4 (7). 17-inducere).
P. li, note 4 , line 3 , dele 5 (8). 4. 1338 b 15 and, and after 1260 a 24 (line 4) add 3. 5. 1278 a 40 and 3. 13. 1283 a 40.
P. lvi, line 21, after 1269 a 18 read $\mathrm{Ms}^{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ add $\operatorname{tis}$ before kiv $\eta_{\sigma a s}$ : $\Pi^{3}$ are probably right in reading simply $\kappa \iota \nu \eta$ 向 $\sigma a s$, which was the reading of $\Gamma$ also (see vol. iii. p. xxv, and critical note on 1340 b 24).
P. lvii, dele lines I-5 (see critical note on 1339 a 29).
P. I5, last line, for ráp read $\gamma$ à $\rho$.

VOL. III.
P. 26 , nine lines from foot of page. Should toùs be added before á $\mu \phi$ от́pous? See vol. iii. p. $3{ }^{1} 5$.
P. 28, line 9, for $\tilde{\eta} \theta \in \sigma \iota$ read $\hat{\epsilon} \theta \in \sigma \iota$ (see Class. Rev. 7. 307).
P. 54, fourteen lines from foot of page, for $\gamma \in \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \theta a \iota \nu \nu \mu \circ \theta \epsilon ́ \epsilon \tau \nu \operatorname{read} \nu о \mu \circ \theta \epsilon ́ \tau \eta \nu$ $\gamma \in \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \theta \alpha \iota$.
P. 61, line 17, after Latin Translation add unless indeed, which is more probable, he copied the annotations from the MS. before him.
P. 76 , eighteen lines from foot of page, read $\delta \rho \theta o \pi \rho a \gamma \epsilon \hat{\nu}$.
P. 76, last line but one, after тoùs ámópous) add In Demosth. Phil. 3. $54 \Sigma$ has $\lambda o t \delta o p i ́ a s ~ \phi o ́ v o v ~(l . ~ \phi \theta o ́ v o v) ~ \sigma \kappa \omega ́ \mu \mu \mu a \tau o s ~ w h e r e ~ o t h e r ~ M S S . ~ h a v e ~ \lambda o t \delta o p i ́ a s ~ \hat{~} \hat{y}$ $\phi \theta \delta$ vov ท̂ $\sigma \kappa \omega \mu \mu a \tau o s$.
P. 78, eleven lines from foot of page, after 23. add 22. ' $16 \mathrm{om} . \Pi^{1}$.
P. 8o, line 19 , for $a \pi o \theta \in \nu$ read $a \pi \omega \theta \in \nu$.
P. 8o, three lines from foot of page, before Almost add See vol. iii. p. xvii.
P. 81, twenty-one lines from foot of page, dele rightly-note). See above on p. 28 .
P. 82, line 19, end of note on 1264 a 8, add Sus. ${ }^{3 \text { a }}$ reads $\phi$ parpias, not фатрías.
P. 84 , twenty lines from foot of page, after rightly add but see explanatory note on 1283 b 4 .
 cannot tell from Vet. Int. develinquere which reading he found in his text. See critical note on 1270 a 21 .
P. 86, five lines from foot of page, after § 77 add (ed. 2, § 694 sqq.).



P. 87 , fourteen lines from foot of page, after render it add 23. Yiv $\in \sigma \theta a i, \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. Sus. : $\gamma \epsilon \nu \epsilon \in \sigma \theta a \iota \mathrm{M}^{s} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ and possibly $\mathrm{\Gamma}$ (Vet. Int. fieri).
P. 87, four lines from foot of page, for (perhaps . . . I 340 b 24) read ( $=\kappa เ \nu \eta \eta_{-}$ бas: see above, p. xxv, and critical note on 1340 b 24).
P. 87, last line, read in.
P. 88, line 10, after Vet. Int. add 6. $\pi \epsilon \rho \rho a \_\beta o i ̂ s ~ \Pi^{2}$ Bekk. : $\pi \epsilon \rho a \iota \beta$ îs $\Pi^{1}$ Sus.: see Class. Rev. 7.307 sq.
P. 92, line 22, after here add It is, however, so used in Eurip. Fragm. 795 Nauck (ed. 2).
P. Ior, line 5. T Ths toavút $\eta$ s may possibly refer forward and mean $\tau \hat{\eta}$ s $\pi \circ \lambda \iota \tau \iota \kappa \hat{s}$ : see the explanatory note on 1337 b 6.
P. 104, line 16. At the end of the note add For $\tau \alpha \grave{\alpha} \pi \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a \tau \alpha$ фvó $\mu \in \nu a$





P. II4, thirteen lines from foot of page, before Plato add חaỉdás тє каì таíסary maîסas may possibly be added because ó $\mu \circ \gamma$ ádaktes standing by itself might be taken to refer only to children, and not to grandchildren also.

P．IIf，ten lines from foot of page．It is probably from Panaetius that Cicero derives the views expressed in De Offic．I．17． 54 ：see C．Hinze，Quos scriptores Graecos Cicero in libris de re publica componendis adhibuerit，p． 50.

P．I15，thirteen lines from foot of page．The passage referred to as 7．13．II is probably 6 （4）．13．II． 1297 b 24 sqq．

P．118，line 14，end of note，add Cp．also Xenophanes，Fragm．5， 6 （Mullach， Fragm．Philos．Gr．I．ror sq．）．
P．I18，seventeen lines from foot of page，add In illustration of $\dot{\epsilon} \kappa \pi \lambda \epsilon \epsilon$ óvav $\kappa \omega \mu \omega \hat{\nu}$ cp．Strabo，p． 336 sub fin．－ 337 ．

P． 123 ，five lines from foot of page，add 12．$\mu$ éxpı үàp тoúrov к．$\tau . \lambda$ ．For the phrase cp．Пєрì $\mu \kappa \kappa \rho \circ \beta \iota 6$ тит os 6.467 a 20 and［Plato，］Epinomis 978 C．
P．128，twenty－one lines from foot of page，after 29．add For $\hat{\eta}$ Onpiov $\hat{\eta} \theta$ 伯
 $\theta \eta p i \omega ̂ \delta \epsilon s$. See also Plut．Aristid．c． 6 sub fin．and De Profect．in Virt．c．I sub fin．
P．I31，ten lines from foot of page，for The ellipse－$\pi \hat{a} \sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon \tau a \lambda \lambda \epsilon u \tau \iota \kappa \eta$ read
 where $\pi \in p i ̀ \tau a u ̂ \tau \alpha$ must apparently be supplied before ö $\sigma a$ ．

P．I33，seventeen lines from foot of page，after $\chi \rho \hat{\eta} \sigma \iota \nu$ add and 8 （6）． 8. 132 I b 16.
P． 138 ，twelve lines from foot of page．Prof．Bywater points out（Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie，Band ii．p．504），no doubt rightly，that the article is used before＇H申aívove because the Hephaestus of Homer＇s Iliad（i8． 376 ）is referred to．It should be noticed，however，that in the Politics the article is almost always prefixed to the names of gods and goddesses．The phrase $\nu \grave{\eta} \Delta i a$ is the only exception I remember．



P．I59，twelve lines from foot of page，$a d d 37 \mathrm{sq}$ ．See explanatory note on 1275 b 21，and cp．Diod．17．77． 3 and Hippocr．De Morb．Vulgar． 6 （vol．iii．


P．164，line $1_{5}$ ，end of note，add Cp．Soph．Philoct． 138 sqq．and Manil． Astron．5． 739 sqq．（where atque omnia iusta priorum should perhaps be read）．

P．169，three lines from foot of page，before Their add and Hippocr．De Aere， Aquis，Locis，c． 18 Kuehlewein（vol．i．p． 556 Kühn），$\mu$ évovaı $\delta^{\prime}{ }_{\epsilon} \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu \tau \hat{\omega}$ av่̉ $\hat{\omega}$



P．171，line 5，before Giph．add Vet．Int．＇quicunque quidem sponte natam habent elaborationem＇：

P．171，line 9，after betreiben＇add J．C．Wilson，＇the industries of which spring up of themselves＇，a rendering which resembles that of Vet．Int．

P．171，line 11，for vita read $\mathfrak{~} \rho \gamma \sigma \sigma$ áa．
P．171，line 22，end of note，after c． 12 add I am not disposed to be dogmatic in support of Victorius＇interpretation of the rare word aútó申utos in the passage before us，but I still incline to think that it is right．See for J．C．Wilson＇s view Class．Rev．Io（1896），p． 187 and Archiv für Gesch．der Phil．11． 260 sq． The meaning of aúvó申utos may be studied in Pindar，Pyth．3．47，where
it seems to mean 'self-engendered' ('self-caused', as Liddell and Scott, not ' sponte natus', as Boeckh): cp. Polyb. 11. 25. 2 Hultsch, rd̀ $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \xi$ aủt $\omega \hat{\nu} \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\sigma \omega \mu \alpha ́ \tau \omega \nu \gamma \iota \nu o ́ \mu \epsilon \nu \alpha$ фú $\mu a \tau \alpha$ каil vóбovs. Its meaning is still clearer in Dio Cass. 44. 37. 2. Here aúróфutos is contrasted with àmò taủro $\mu$ átou and explained by $\epsilon \in / \kappa \pi \alpha \rho a \sigma \kappa \epsilon v \eta \eta_{s} \sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu 0 \hat{s}$, and it seems to mean 'self-bred', 'self-engendered', i. e. engendered by the stock of which the person comes ('bon chien chasse de
 (Theophrast. ap. Julian, Epist. 24, referred to by Liddell and Scott). Cp.also the use of aúroфús in Plato, Laws 794 A, where it is explained by às $\mathfrak{\epsilon} \pi \epsilon i \delta \dot{d} \nu$ $\xi v \nu \epsilon \lambda \theta \omega \sigma \iota \nu$ aủroi $\sigma \chi \epsilon \delta \partial ̀ \nu a \dot{\alpha} \in \nu p i \sigma \kappa o v \sigma \iota$. If aủtóфutos in the passage before us meant 'springing up of itself', we should expect that exchange ( $\dot{a} \lambda \lambda a \gamma \eta$ ), if not carried too far, would be described by Aristotle as aútóфutos, for he says in 1. 9. 1257 a 18 sq. that exchange not carried beyond a certain point is necessary. Yet he nowhere describes the necessary kind of exchange as aủ兀óфvtos.
 lives were often conjoined we see from Strabo, P. 511.
P. 172, nine lines from foot of page, after 1216 a 7 add Cp. also [Plato,]

 [Plato,] Menex. 237 E, and [Demosth.] Or. Fun. c. 5, $\pi \alpha ́ \nu \tau \alpha ~ \gamma \alpha ̀ \rho ~ \tau a ̀ ~ \tau i k \tau о \nu \tau \alpha ~$

P. ェ79, sixteen lines from foot of page, after $\sigma v \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \in \nu$ dele and in... 1253 b 3).
P. I81, line 10, after 3. add €̈์ть $\delta^{\prime}$ ои̉тє к.т. $\boldsymbol{\lambda}$. Cp. Hist. An. 1. 13. 493 a 33,

P. 187, end of note on $\tau 0 \hat{v} \pi \lambda$ oútov rai $\chi \rho \eta \mu a ́ \tau \omega \nu$, add For the account of $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \tau \iota \epsilon$ here given cp. Plato, Gorg. $45^{2} \mathrm{C}$, where the $\chi \rho \eta \mu a \tau \iota \sigma \tau \dot{\prime}$ s claims to be $\pi \lambda$ ли́тov $\delta \eta \mu$ iov $\rho \gamma$ ós.
P. 188, line 12, before Eryxias $a d d$ the saying of Solon to Croesus reported in Diod. 9. 27.2 , of Plato, Rep. 521 A and Laws $74^{2} \mathrm{E}$, and of.
 probably has before him Plato, Laws 962 A .
P. 203, lines 3-5. I prefer to the interpretation of this passage given here that given by Sus., and independently with greater fullness and clearness by J. C. Wilson in Class. Rev. Io (1896), p. I84 sqq. and Archiv für Gesch. der Phil. II. 246 sqq. and 12. 50 sqq. The latter explains ő $\sigma \alpha$ ả $\pi \delta \gamma \eta \bar{\gamma}$ by õ $\sigma \alpha \mu \epsilon ́ \rho \eta$

 ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \eta$ тоtav́t $\eta$, and translates the whole passage 'all the forms of acquisition (or all the industries) which make their profit from minerals and from things growing from the earth which, though not edible (or fruits), are still useful.' One difficulty in connexion with this rendering should be noticed. In the
 twice, and one would expect them to be used in the same sense in both places, but in the first place we have to translate them 'from mincrals' (i.e. from rock, metal, soil, sand, etc.) and in the second 'from the earth ' (i.e. from soil, but not from rock, metal, or sand). We need not make too much of this difficulty,
but it seems to me to exist. It appears also to be implied, which we hardly
 food from that source (Oecon. 1. 1343 a 30 sqq.: cp. Plut. Numa, c. 16, where $\gamma \in a p \gamma i a$ is described as $\delta \dot{\alpha} \pi \dot{\partial} \gamma \hat{\eta} s$ Bios), but this is implied in Oecon. 1. 1343 a 26 sqq. also, so that this passage is open to the same objection.
P. 203, line 5, after 1256 b 26 add and cp. 6 (4). 16. 1300 b 20 , ${ }^{\text {ét } \tau \rho о \nu}$
 or something equivalent before ö $\sigma a$.
P. 203, last line but one. I have here taken $\lambda \omega \beta \hat{\omega} \nu \tau a \iota$ in $\tau \grave{\alpha} \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau a \lambda \omega \beta \hat{\omega} \nu$ $\tau \alpha \iota$ as passive and $\tau a ̀ \sigma \dot{\omega} \mu a \tau \alpha$ as the nom. to it, but it is more likely that $\lambda \omega \beta \hat{\omega} \nu$ rat is middle, and that the words should be constrned, 'men injure their bodies'.
P. 206, lines 10-12, dele $\dot{3} \lambda \lambda a ̀ \mu \grave{\eta} \nu-1339$ a 29.
P. 209, twenty-two lines from foot of page, after tòv oirovó $\mu 0 \nu$ add Cp . (with J. C. Wilson) Kühner, Ausführl. gr. Gramm., ed. 2, § 593, Anm. I.
P. 209, twenty-one lines from foot of page, after 1253 b 4 sq. add for though, as Sus. has pointed out, it has not been said there or in any preceding passage that the rule of the husband over the wife is a political rule and the rule of the father over the child a kingly rule, it has nevertheless been implied in c. 3. $1_{253} \mathrm{I}_{4}$ sqq. that these two kinds of rule are two and not one. Aristotle perhaps adds $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \lambda d \ldots$... $\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda \iota \iota \omega ิ s$ somewhat unguardedly in his eagerness to explain at once how the one kind of rule differs from the other. A similar inexactness of reference occurs in 1. 5. 1254 b . 3 , $\ddot{\omega} \sigma \pi \epsilon \rho$ 伯 $\gamma \sigma \mu \epsilon \nu$ (see also explanatory notes on 1312 b 34 and 1321 b 5), and it is not, I think, necessary to suppose (with Sus.) a lacuna before the words rai $\gamma \dot{\alpha} \rho$ к. $\tau . \lambda$. These words, as Vict. has seen, are closely connected with what precedes. See J. C. Wilson's remarks in Archiv für Gesch. der Phil. 12. 52 sqq.
P. 210, lines 16-20. Perhaps it is better (with Sepulveda) to supply tò ăppev кaì rò $\theta \hat{\eta} \lambda \nu$ with $\sigma \nu \nu \epsilon ́ \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon$ than to take $\sigma v \nu \dot{\epsilon} \sigma \tau \eta \kappa \epsilon$ as impersonal, as I have here done.
P. 213 , line 17 , after quoted add Cp. also 6 (4). I. 1289 a 3 , wis $\epsilon \notin \tau \tau \downarrow$ oủk

 explanatory note on Pol. 4 (7). 8. 1328 b 11.
P. 217, line II, after Cp. add Sext. Empir. Adv. Math. 4. 3. p. 722. I2
 $\tau \bar{\eta} s \psi u \chi \eta ิ s$, and.



P. 223, line 13, after with him add Cp. Athen. Deipn. 262 b, rav́ras $\gamma$ àp


P. 223, fourteen lines from foot of page, after $\pi \epsilon i \theta \in \sigma \theta a \iota ~ a d d$ and Xen. De Re Equestri 8. 13. I incline now to follow Stahr, not Bonitz, in his interpretation of $\lambda$ óros in this passage.
P. 238, lines 3-5. Prof. Robinson Ellis adds other Greek examples to those

 closer Latin parallels-Ovid, Met. 15.96,

At vetus illa aetas cui fecimus Aurea nomen,
and Plin. Epist. 3. 2, cum dico princeps ('where J. E. B. Mayor has a learned note'). See Prof. Ellis' commentary on Catull. Ixxxvi. 3 (ed. 2).
P. 239, ten lines from foot of page, for is probably read may be.
P. 239, seven lines from foot of page, after p. 79) add But Hecataeus and others had written $\gamma \hat{\eta} s \pi \epsilon \rho i o \delta o \iota$ (Bywater).
P. 242, eighteen lines from foot of page, after tîs dele 3. $4 \ldots$. тaủrá, and.
P. 243, eight lines from foot of page, add 26. Eis rov̀s фú入akas and 27. eis ékeivous. 'We often find cis used of movement to persons, for instance in De Caelo 1. 3. 270 b 20 and Pol. 2. 4. 1262 b 26, $27^{\prime}$ (Eucken, Praepositionen, p. 33).
 my remarks on the passage in Class. Rev. 7. 30\%.
P. 254, line 16. I do not feel sure that Sus. intended to render kai by 'gerade', and I doubt whether it can bear this meaning here. Perhaps kaí means simply 'also', and the sense is 'since we see that those also quarrel who own property in common, as well as owners of several property, and indeed that the former quarrel more than the latter', etc.
P. 254 , line 25 , after p. 54.2 add See as to these cases of undivided property Dio Chrys. Or. 38, 2. 15 I R. Cp. Lucan, De Bell. Civ. 1. 84 ,

Tu causa malorum
Facta tribus dominis communis, Roma.
P. 255, line 18, after 36. add $\pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os ô $\nu$, not oû $\sigma \alpha \nu$, though $\tau \eta े \nu \pi \delta \lambda_{\iota \nu}$ is to be supplied: cp. Plato, Cratyl. 418 E and Stallbaum's note, and see Kiihner, Ausführl. gr. Gramm., ed. Gerth, § 369. 3.
P. 256 , nine lines from foot of page, add $\tau 0$ îs $\delta^{\prime}$ oủ Xpêvral $\gamma เ v \omega \dot{\kappa} \kappa$ ovtes.
 $\alpha u ̉<o i ̂ s ~ \chi \rho \eta ิ \sigma \theta \epsilon$.
P. 267 , twenty lines from foot of page, end of note on 1265 a 12 , add This


P. 267 , line 26. I have here taken $\tau \grave{\partial} \nu \hat{v} \nu$ єíp $\eta \mu \in ́ \nu 0 \nu \pi \lambda \hat{\eta} \theta$ os as an 'anticipatory accusative', but it may be, as Prof. R. Ellis points out, the direct subject of $\lambda a \nu \theta a ́ \nu \epsilon \iota \nu$.
P. 269 , twenty-three lines from foot of page, after using property add Cp. also Cic. De Offic. 1. $27 \cdot 96$, ut in eo moderatio et temperantia appareat cum specie quadam liberali.
P. 269 , fourteen lines from foot of page, after $\mu \in \tau p t o ́ \tau \eta s$ add See Class. Kev. 7. 309.
P. 270, line 20, after § 4 I .4 add (ed. 2. § 216 ).
P. 27 I , line 4, after 1335 b 22 sq. add Tésva must be supplied with $\pi \lambda$ eiova from tenvotohiav (see Bon. Ind. 239 a 39 sqq.).
P. 275 , last line but four, and p. 277 , line 9 , 'checked by an approach to the principle of the lot'. See below on p. 335 , last line.

P．283，twenty lines from foot of page，after given add（see explanatory note on 7 （5）．5．1304 b $3^{\text {I }}$ ）．

P．293，line 5，after name add See Sandys＇note on＇A日．Пo入．c．28，1．20，$\tau \grave{\eta} v$ б $\iota \omega \beta \in \lambda i a \nu$ ．

P．293，line I 3 ，after r．т．入．add and Demosth．Prooem．5．p．1422， $\mathfrak{\eta} \mu \mathrm{e} v$ oûv
 $\mu a \theta \in i v$, and Prooem．IS．p． 1430.

P．298，line 10，after 1326 a $3^{2}$ ）add Hippodamus＇wish to be learned about Nature as a whole reminds us of the similar teaching of Hippocrates referred to in Plato，Phaedrus 270 C．See also Stewart on Eth．Nic．I．13．7． 1102 a 19.

P．304，line 7，after nowvociv add See，however，vol．iii．p．xvii．
P．307，last line，after elँ add Or perhaps admirers of Lacedaemonian customs：
 кıveîv toùs עó $\mu$ ovs．See R．Hirzel，＂Aypaфos vó $\mu$ os，p．72． 2.

P．308，line 20 ，after e．g．dele in $3.9 \ldots \sigma \chi \delta \delta \partial \nu \quad$ वá $\rho$ ，and．
P．309，line 26．Maptúp $\nu \nu \tau \hat{\omega} \nu$ aúvồ $\sigma v \gamma \gamma \epsilon \nu \omega ิ \nu$ is probably intended to be emphasized by hyperbaton，the words ó ס $\iota \omega$ ccuv $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu$ фóvov being interposed after $\mu a \rho \tau u ́ p a \nu: ~ s e e ~ v o l . ~ i i i . ~ A p p e n d i x ~ B . ~ . ~$

P．314，line 5 sqq．It is likely that the Polities were written，not before，as I have implied here，but after，the Politics．
P． 316 ，nineteen lines from foot of page，after $\tau \grave{\eta} \nu \gamma \eta \eta^{2} \nu a d d 40$ ．For the
 1318 a 15 sqq．，where see note．
P． 3 18，line 8．Prof．R．Ellis much prefers Victorius＇way of taking the passage，＇We ought to think that a city approximates to a division into equal halves as divided into men and women＇．

P．319，line 2，after इavpoцá̃aı add Nic．Damasc．Fragm． 122 （Müller，
 $\delta \in \sigma \pi o^{\prime} \nu a l s$, Strabo，p． $16_{5}$ ，as to the Cantabri，and Plut．Cato Censor，c．8，as to the Romans．

P． 323 ，line 5 sq．See above on p． 314 ，line 5 sqq．
P．334，line 1o，for According to Plutarch read We read of Agesilaus in


P．334，line 25 ，after 1266 b 23 add Contrast the view of Plutarch，Lycurg．



P．335，last line．It has been pointed out by Mr．J．Solomon（Class．Rev． 3．295：see Susemihl，Jahresbericht für Altertumswissenschaft，1891，Bericht iiber Aristoteles，etc．，fiir $1887-1890$ ，p．124）that this expression of Plato refers not to the ephorate，as Stallbaum and others have thought，but to the kingship．

P．338，line 3，before For add Mimnermus had said of old age（Fragm． 5 Bergk），

## 

## Cp．Herondas 1.67 sq．and Hdt． 3 ． 134 ．

P．339，note on 1271 a 14 ．I am inclined still to read tov́re，but to inter－ pret it in a slightly different way from that in which I have interpreted it in




P. 350, fourteen lines from foot of page, add 38. Tàs $\delta$ ' $\mathbf{\varphi} \kappa \iota \sigma \in v$. 'Ceos is called by Bacchylides (2.8) Eủgavris vẫos, a title hitherto unknown, but evidently implying a claim to have been colonized by the son of Minos' (Kenyon, Poems of Bacchylides, p. xxvii).
P. 355 , twelve lines from foot of page, after ${ }_{\epsilon} \ell \delta \epsilon \epsilon a$ add Hippocr. De Morbis


P. $35^{8}$, line 4 , for of read ascribed to.
P. 359, line 19, after $\sigma \tau \alpha \dot{\sigma} \iota v$ ) add Cp. also Plut. Cato Minor, c. 45 , where

 $\dot{\epsilon} a \nu \tau \hat{\varphi} \mu \nu \eta \sigma \tau \epsilon v \delta \mu \epsilon \nu \circ s$, and Justin 16. 4. 6.
P. 36 r , four lines from foot of page, dele c. 12. 1274 a 2.
P. $3^{62}$, five lines from foot of page, dele the parenthesis, ' $\mathrm{cp} . .$. . changes', and see critical note on 1299 b 27 .
P. 366 , nineteen lines from foot of page, for all magistracies read all magistracies empowered to try cases.
P. 371, note on 1273 b i9. I incline now to adopt the reading $\tau \hat{\varphi} \pi \lambda$ outiS $\epsilon \nu$.
P. 373, fifteen lines from foot of page, for as he found them read in existence.
P. 374 , nineteen lines from foot of page, note on $1274 \mathrm{a}^{2}$. T $\mathrm{\partial} \nu \bar{\nu} \delta \bar{\eta} \mu \nu$ kaza$\sigma \tau \eta \sigma a \iota$ probably means not 'set up the demos', as I have interpreted it in this note, but 'set up the democracy' (cp. 8 (6). 4. 1319b 22, oi $\tau \grave{\nu} \nu \delta \bar{\eta} \mu \circ \nu$ каөıбтávтes).
P. 375 , line io. As to the meaning of the expression $\tau \dot{d}$ M $\eta \delta \delta_{n} \alpha$, see vol. iii. p. 554 .
P. 376 , line 18 , for The fact... 1537 a 20 sqq.) read See 'A $\theta$. Пod. c. 7 , 1. 9 sqq.
P. 379, line 4, after latter $\alpha d d$ and which represented the Chalcidian Charondas as a disciple of Zaleucus, the lawgiver of the Italian Locri, a not too friendly rival of the Chalcidic colonies of Italy and Sicily.
P. 384 , line 3 , after ${ }^{1} 55 \mathrm{E}$ add ' In inscriptions of the Attic period there is no trace of an exception to this rule' (Prof. Bywater, Avchiv für Gesch. der Phil. 2. 504). See on this subject Sus. ${ }^{4}$, vol. i, p. 682.
 that one and the same lawgiver gave laws to all the Thraceward Chalcidiansan early indication of the tendency to unity which they afterwards displayed in grouping themselves round Olynthus-and that this lawgiver was a citizen of Rhegium, itself a colony of Chalcis.

## Vol. III.

P. xix, end of note, add and in 1312 a 11,18 all the MSS. have tois $\mu$ ovipxots. In 1295 a I 3 also $\mathrm{M}^{8} \mathrm{P}^{1}$ have $\mu$ óvap $\mathrm{X}^{\circ}$ with $\mathrm{\Pi}^{2}$.
P. II, line I , colon in place of full stop.
P. II, line 17 , colon in place of full stop.
P. 2I, line 9, for toût read roûr'.
P. 37 , line 13 , dele comma.
P. 89 , line 1 , for ac si read ac si utique.
P. 9I, line 4, after ímepé $\chi o v \tau a s ~ a d d ~ S e e ~ o n ~ t h e ~ s u b j e c t ~ o f ~ t h i s ~ n o t e ~ v o l . ~ i i i . ~$ Appendix C.
P. 93, last line, for have read sometimes show. See vol. iii. Appendix C.

P. IoI, fourteen lines from foot of page, after Musurus add See critical note on I3II a $3^{6-39 .}$
P. IO4, line 17, after $\delta$ v́o? add Yet compare 6 (4). 7. 1293 a 37 , where we have $\lambda$ '́ $\gamma o v \sigma \iota ~ \delta e ̀ ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \tau a p a s, ~ n o t ~ \tau a ̀ s ~ \tau \epsilon ́ \tau \tau a p a s . ~$
P. IO5, eleven lines from foot of page, after in place of it add (with Madvig, Adversaria Critica, I. 468 sq.).



P. 126, line 21, after -as add and - $\epsilon 1$ s.
P. 144, seven lines from foot of page, read $\kappa$ кiбavtes.
P. 156 , three lines from foot of page. This is one of several passages in which it is doubtful which word in the sentence is the subject and which the predicate. Among these passages are the following-3. $6.1278 \mathrm{~b} 1 \mathrm{I}, 3.7$. 1279 a 26 sq ., 3.13 .1283 b 42 sqq . I have followed most of the translators and commentators in the view I have taken on this question in my notes on these passages, but there is much to be said for the opposite view, and I do not

 (see also 6 (4). 12. 1297 a 5 sq. ) ; yet in 3. 1. 1275 a 22 sq ., where $\tau \delta \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi \lambda \hat{\omega} \mathrm{s}$
 sentence (see also 6 (4). 3 . 1290a 7 sq.).
 perhaps rightly (cp. 7 (5). $8.1308 \mathrm{~b} 33 \mathrm{sq}$. .).
P. 189, fifteen lines from foot of page, dele comma.
P. 191, line 4, after Hdt. I. 97. 2 add and Plato, Rep. 347 A-D.
P. 191, three lines from foot of page, after conduct add (This remark is borrowed from Hobbes, Leviathan, c. 19, 'Now in monarchy the private interest is the same with the public. The riches, power, and honour of a monarch arise only from the riches, strength, and reputation of his subjects ', etc.).
P. 196, seven lines from foot of page, after preferred add The next àmopía is whether the version of justice put forward by the partisans of oligarchy and democracy is satisfactory. This $\dot{a} \pi o \rho i a$ is discussed in c. 9.


P. 204, line 18, for Cf. read Cp.
P. 206, seventeen lines from foot of page, dele Pol. 7 (5). 9. I309a 36.
P. 210, line 6, after force add comma.
P. 212 , twelve lines from foot of page, before 40. add 39. $\pi \epsilon \rho i \mu \epsilon ̀ v$ oűv $\tau \hat{\omega} v$
 $\tau \omega ิ \nu$ ä̀ $\lambda \lambda \omega \nu$ '̈́t $\tau \rho o s ~ \lambda o ́ \gamma o s . ~$
P. 220, line 10, after the true one add A distinction is, in fact, drawn in 6 (4). 14. 1298 b 8 sqq. between $\alpha i \rho \in \tau о i ́$ and $\kappa \lambda \eta \rho \omega \tau о \grave{\text { ék }} \pi \pi \rho о к р i \tau \omega \nu$.
P. 238 , line $1_{5}$, after $\pi \epsilon ́ \tau \in \sigma \theta a \iota$ add Cp. Aristoph. Eq. 384 sq.
P. 258, eight lines from foot of page, add In Nymphis, Fragm. I5 (Müller,

P. 260, eleven lines from foot of page, after Kingship? add It would seem from Diod. I5. 60. 5 that the office of the rayós might be so classed.
P. 264, eight lines from foot of page, see above on p. 260.
P. 267 , seventeen lines from foot of page, for 'E $\pi \iota \mu \epsilon \nu \eta s$ read ' $E \pi \iota \mu \epsilon \in \eta \rho^{\prime}$.
P. 272 , line 19, after 3 I sqq. add In this passage Aristotle is speaking of Kingship in both $\pi \delta \lambda^{\lambda} \epsilon i s$ and ${ }^{\prime} \theta \nu \eta$ (cp. 7 (5). 10. 1310 b 35), whereas in the passage before us he seems to refer only to Kingships in $\pi \delta{ }^{\lambda} \lambda \epsilon t s$ (cp. 1285 b I3,

P. 272, six lines from foot of page, for $\tau o ́ v$ read $\tau \dot{\nu} \nu$.
P. 288 (and p. 418), page-heading, after NOTES add full stop.
P. 301, eleven lines from foot of page, after rule) add and Polyb. 6. 2. I4 Hultsch.
P. 308 , line 2 , for $v \pi \alpha \rho \chi o ́ v \tau \omega \nu$ read $\dot{v} \pi a \rho \chi \delta ́ \nu \tau \omega \nu$.
P. 3I2, line 1 , for $\pi \epsilon \rho \iota$ read $\pi \epsilon \rho i$.
P. 3I7, twelve lines from foot of page, after Protag. 323 D sq. add and Seneca, Epist. 123, nemo est casu bonus.
P. $3^{18}$, line II, before latter add the.
P. 342, line 6. Perhaps it is more likely that Megalopolis was founded in B. C. 370 than in B.C. 369. See Grote, Hist. of Greece, IO. 3I9, note 5 (Part 2, c. 78), and Frazer, Pausanias 4. 30\%.
P. 345, line 8, end of note, add Cp. also Plin. Epist. I. 20. 5.

P. 363 , twenty-two lines from foot of page, after тoút $\omega \nu$ add and $\Pi \epsilon \rho i$ aioөウ்-

P. 370, five lines from foot of page, after military duties $a d d$ and provides in the Laws (see vol. i. p. 446) that the Nomophylakes are not to remain in office after they have attained seventy years of age.
P. $3^{85}$, line 5 , for $\delta \iota \epsilon \xi \epsilon \lambda \theta \omega \dot{\nu} \nu$ read $\delta \iota \epsilon \xi \epsilon \lambda \theta \omega ̀ \nu \nu$.
P. 386, seven lines from foot of page, after other laws also add For $\tau \hat{\omega} \nu \dot{\alpha} \pi^{\prime}$

P. $3^{87}$, three lines from foot of page, 'all other'. It is possible that $\tau \grave{\alpha} \alpha{ }_{\alpha} \lambda \lambda \alpha$ means here ' other things than $\tau \dot{\alpha} \pi \epsilon \rho i \tau d s \pi o \lambda \iota \tau \epsilon i a s ~(30)$ ', and not, as I have taken these words to mean, 'other things than syssitia and the division into classes'.
P. 4I4, line 17, after Greece add But Aristotle's main object is to place the gymnasium of the elders in the immediate neighbourhood, and under the eye, of the chief magistrates. It must, therefore, be situated, like the agora, under the hill on which the chief magistrates dwell.
P. 418 , eighteen lines from foot of page, after contracts add at any rate those which were made in the agora.
P. 428 , line 3, after 日ávarov add For the thought cp. Eth. Nic. I. II. IIoo b 35 sqq.
P. 428 , line 18, after 116 b 8 sqq. add and Eth. Nic. 5. 10. 1134 b 3 sq.
P. 433, thirteen lines from foot of page, for ảkov́ovtè read ảkov́ovтєs.
P. 434, line 4, for $\beta \in \lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$ read $\beta$ '́ $\lambda \tau \iota \sigma \tau \epsilon$.
P. 475, line 11, after 1. 254) add In Пєpì veór

 and 21.480 b 12, 19 sq., Aristotle seems to make some concessions to this view.
P. 483 , ten lines from foot of page, after life add Cp. also חєpì vinvou 3 . 457 a 3 sqq.
P. 487 , nineteen lines from foot of page. My rendering of $\gamma^{i v \in \tau \alpha l} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \dot{\alpha} \rho \kappa . \tau . \lambda$. is that of the translators generally, but it would be possible to translate the words, 'for in a way exercise results to the bodies [of the children]'. Cp. 7 (5). 6.


P. 49I, nine lines from foot of page, before Compare add and Frazer, Pausanias 2. 492.
P. 497, twenty lines from foot of page. We need not perhaps interpret $\delta \iota \eta \rho \eta \hat{\sigma} \theta a \iota$ so strictly as to infer from it, as I have done here, that Aristotle intended the education of his future citizens to be carried on beyond twenty-one, though it is on other grounds not improbable that he did so.
P. 500, line 12 , for $\mathfrak{c i} k \hat{\eta}$ read $\epsilon i \kappa \hat{n}$.
P. 500 , line 20 , after 1366 a 36 sqq. $a d d$ and see explanatory note on $125^{8}$ a 10.
P. 505 , line I , for $\epsilon \mu a ́ \nu \theta a \nu o \nu$ read ${ }_{\epsilon}^{\epsilon} \mu \dot{\alpha} \nu \theta a \nu o \nu$.
P. 507, line 2, after 1319b 19 sqq. add Cp. also Thuc. 8. 89. 3 ( $\tau \hat{\varphi}$ тotov́rạ . . . ${ }^{\epsilon} \nu \stackrel{3}{\Psi} \pi \epsilon \rho$ ).
P. $50 \%$, twelve lines from foot of page, after $\mu \dot{a} \theta \eta \sigma \iota \nu$ add comma.
P. 509 , fourteen lines from foot of page, after himself add (cp. Athen. Deipn. 18 a sq.).
P. 509 , last line but one, for $\hat{a} \nu$ read ăv.
P. $5^{24}$, line 2 , after c. 34.1. 4 add and c. 48 .1.16, raîs à [ $\left.\gamma o p\right]$ aîs.
P. 524 , line 7 , for $\mu \eta$ read $\mu \bar{\eta}$.
P. $5^{2}$, nine lines from foot of page, after fifteen add As to light and heavy gymnastic exercises see Frazer, Pausanias 4. Io3.


P. 545 , seventeen lines from foot of page, for Muller read Müller.
P. $54^{8}$, three lines from foot of page, dele the first comma.
P. 557, line II, for Tn read $\tau \hat{n}$.
P. 559 , four lines from foot of page, add As to rhythm and melody see Abert, Die Lehre vom Ethos in der griechischen Musik, pp. 53-56.
P. 575 , nineteen lines from foot of page, read $5 \frac{7}{8}$.
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[^0]:    
    1275 b 39, кaì for кầ
    $1276 \mathrm{~b} 9, \lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ for $\lambda \epsilon ́ \gamma o \mu \epsilon \nu$ (or has ä̀ been omitted?)

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ This error may probably be due to the misreading of a contraction．

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ In 1312 a 29 , however, $\mathrm{P}^{1}$ has roîs $\mu 0 \nu a ́ \rho \chi o u s$ with $\Pi^{2}$, while $\Gamma \mathrm{M}^{8}$ have roís $\mu$ ovápXaıs. See also Additions and Corrections.

[^3]:    1261 a $14, \delta_{t \epsilon \lambda \epsilon i \nu} \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}, \delta_{\epsilon \epsilon \lambda} \theta_{\epsilon i \nu}$ the rest;
    
    1276 b 33 , where $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ add a sentence missing in the other MSS., except that in two it is added by correctors;
    
    
    33, $\pi \lambda \epsilon$ tióv $\omega{ }^{2} \mathrm{P}^{1}, \pi \lambda \epsilon$ iovos the rest ;
    1327 b 34 , om. кai $\Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$, not so the rest;
    ${ }^{1} 334$ a $37, ~ \Gamma \mathrm{P}^{1}$ add a sentence missing in the rest;
    

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ E．g．in 1332 a 27,1288 b 3r， 1289 a 14， 1290 b 4， 1297 b 8， 1298 b 27， 1305 a 16.
    ${ }^{2}$ E．g．in 1281 a 19， 1287 a 32， 1313 b $15,16$.
    ${ }^{3}$ E．g．in 1291 a 7 and 1298 a 19.
    4 E．g．in 1287 a 27 （dant for סíðん⿰七v）， 1307 b 33 （parvae ex－ pensae for тò $\mu$ ккро̀̀ ठатávŋ $\mu$ a）， 1321 a 40 （expensarum for $\tau \bar{\eta} s$ סanávns）， 1322 a 19 （divisi sunt for $\delta$ ！
    ${ }^{5}$ E．g．in 1338 b in（speciem for Tù єídך），1296a 34， 35 （democratian and oligarchiam for $\delta \eta \mu о к \rho a t i a s$ and ò $\lambda$ เyapxias）， 1303 a 14 （vere－ cundiam for tàs éptécias）， 1310 b 34 （beneficium for єv̇єруєбias）．

[^5]:    －E．g．in 1283 a 35 （generosi for $\gamma$ ย $\nu$ vatótepot）， 1287 b 9 （multos for $\pi \lambda$（iovas）， 1331 a 30 （eminenter
     gressivas for $\pi \lambda \epsilon о \nu \epsilon к т$ ткште́pas）， 1298 a 36 （mediocribus for $\mu \mathrm{\epsilon}$－ $\tau \rho \omega \tau$ т́ $\rho \omega \nu$ ）， 1299 b 12 （facile for рạò $)$ ．
    ${ }^{7}$ E．g．in 1276 a 19 （super－ ficialis for émutro入aloóátๆ）．
    ${ }^{8}$ E．g．in 1315 a 26 （ampliori for $\pi \lambda \epsilon i \sigma \pi \eta s)$ ．
    ${ }^{9}$ E．g．in 1330 a 41 （recentiores for єยХХєірєроя）， 1293 a 30 （plus for $\pi \sigma \lambda \dot{\prime})$.
    ${ }^{10}$ E．g．in 1292 b 29 （neces－ sariissimas for àvayкaias）．

[^6]:    ${ }^{1}$ Yet it is allowed in 7 (5). I. claim to be considered absolutely 1301 a 39 sqq. that those who excel in virtue have a plausible

[^7]:    ${ }^{1}$ See the late Prof. H. Sidgwick's remarks in Class. Rev. 6. 143, and my own in 6.291 sq.

[^8]:    ${ }^{1}$ This would only be true of the children of the better-to-do citizens, for we gather from 8 (6). 8. 1323 a 5 sq . that the poorer citizens had no slaves.
    ${ }_{2}^{2}$ Aristotle's feeling as to utilitarianism in education may be gathered from his remark (4 (7). 14. 1333 b I sqq.) that the aim in the education of the young should be to fit them to do both work which is necessary and useful and work which is noble, but the latter more than the former. He treats as vulgar (фортıкóv) the preference of 'virtues thought to be useful and more productive of gain' to

[^9]:    ${ }^{1}$ We miss in Aristotle's scheme of education any training specially designed to develope activity in accordance with virtue, though
    he lays stress on this as an element in happiness (4 (7). I. 1323 b 22, 40 sqq.).

[^10]:    VOL. III.

[^11]:    VOL. III.
    H h

[^12]:    ${ }^{1}$ In 1302 b 5 all MSS. have riva
    
    ${ }^{2}$ In $133^{8}$ a 25 , on the other hand,
    $\Pi^{1}$ have $\bar{\pi} \pi i$ Saîra ka入єiv $\theta a \lambda \epsilon i \eta v$ and $\Pi^{2}$ ка入єîv $\ell \pi i$ סaîta $\theta a \lambda \epsilon i \eta \nu$, where $\Pi^{2}$ are evidently wrong.

